

CENTRAL ASIATIC JOURNAL

INTERNATIONAL PERIODICAL
FOR THE LANGUAGES, LITERATURE,
HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY OF
CENTRAL ASIA

VOLUME VI

Nr. 2

June 1961

joint publication of

MOUTON & CO.
THE HAGUE

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ
WIESBADEN

EDITORIAL BOARD

PROF. DR. W. EBERHARD (Berkeley)
 PROF. DR. K. ENOKI (Tokyo)
 PROF. DR. R. N. FRYE (Cambridge, Mass.)
 PROF. DR. H. HOFFMANN (München)
 PROF. DR. O. MAENCHEN-HELFEN (Berkeley)
 PROF. DR. K. H. MENGES (New York)
 PROF. DR. N. POPPE (Seattle)
 PROF. DR. O. PRITSAK (Hamburg)
 PROF. DR. A. Z. V. TOGAN (Istanbul)

EDITOR IN CHIEF:

PROF. DR. K. JAHN (Leiden)
 ADDRESS: KAREL DOORMANLAAN 27, UTRECHT (Holland)

★

For the United States of America, Germany, Austria, and Switzerland:
 Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden (Germany), Taunusstrasse 5
For all other countries:
 Mouton & Co., Publishers, The Hague (Holland)

★

*Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft
 und der Nederlandse Organisatie voor Zuiver Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek*
Gesamtherstellung: Druckerei Mouton & Co., Den Haag (Holland)
Preis für den Jahrgang: DM 37,60; Einzelheft DM 11,—

★

CONTENTS

JAMES E. BOSSON, A Rediscovered Xylograph Fragment from the Mongolian 'Phags-pa Version of the <i>Subhāṣitaratnanidhi</i>	85
DAVID M. FARQUHAR, A Note on the Mongolian Books in the Gest Chinese Research Library, Princeton University	103
R. O. MEISEZAH, Zu einigen tibetischen Namen unter den Holzschnitten im 'Khrun's rabs gsol 'debs nor bu'i phren ba sku brñan dan bčas pa.	105
KARL H. MENGES, Zum Stammesnamen der Saγaj	110
C. E. BOSWORTH, The Early Islamic History of Ghūr	116
TSING YUAN, Yakub Beg (1820–1877) and the Moslem Rebellion in Chinese Turkestan	134
REVIEW	168

A REDISCOVERED XYLOGRAPH FRAGMENT FROM THE MONGOLIAN 'PHAGS-PA VERSION OF THE *SUBHĀṢĪTARATNANIDHI*

by

JAMES E. BOSSON

University of Washington, Seattle

The second volume of *Mongolica der Berliner Turfan-Sammlung*, recently published by Erich Haenisch,¹ contains two rather well preserved xylograph folios of the Mongolian 'Phags-pa version of the famous *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* by Sa-skya Paṇḍita. This is apparently one of the fragments from the Berlin Collection that were misplaced and lost during the war. T. F. Carter reproduced the left half of the first page in a publication in 1925,² and this was the only part of the fragment available to Pentti Aalto in 1955; but thanks to the efforts of Professor Haenisch it has now been refound and is available for research.

The fragment in question is the largest of the three fragments of the 'Phags-pa edition that have been found and published. In 1912 Gustav Ramstedt published a xylograph fragment written in 'Phags-pa script, which Marshal Mannerheim had found in Chinese Turkestan,³ and in 1952 Pentti Aalto ingeniously reconstructed the text and identified it.⁴ Consequently Professor Aalto published an article on a second 'Phags-pa fragment of the work,⁵ and in a third article he added the above mentioned fragment which had been published by Carter.⁶

Thus three fragments of this very interesting document, which is the

¹ Erich Haenisch, *Mongolica der Berliner Turfan-Sammlung*, II: *Mongolische Texte der Berliner Turfan-Sammlung in Faksimile* (= *Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin; Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Künste*, Jhg. 1959, Nr. 1) (Berlin, 1959).

² T. F. Carter, *The Invention of Printing in China and Its Spread Westwards* (New York, 1925).

³ *JSFOu*, 27 (1912), p. 3.

⁴ "Altaistica", I, *Studia Orientalia*, VII:7 (Helsinki, 1952), pp. 1-9.

⁵ "A Second Fragment of the Mongolian *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* in Mongolian Quadratic Script", *JSFOu*, 57, p. 5.

⁶ "Fragmente des mongolischen *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* in Quadratschrift", *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung*, III:2, pp. 279-290. (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Berlin, 1955).

only Mongolian literary composition in 'Phags-pa script – albeit a translation – of which parts of a xylograph edition have been preserved, have now been published, and, thanks to Professor Aalto, identified and studied.

The Mannerheim fragment and fragment T III D 322:D 2 of the Berlin Turfan Collection he identified as being part of folio number 1 of the xylograph edition. Fragment T III D 322:D 1 clearly shows the page numbers 10 and 11 respectively. This fragment shows that each folio contains twenty lines, and with three lines per stanza this allows six and two-thirds stanzas on each side. By comparing the fragments with the MS published by Ligeti⁷ one can approximately reconstruct the length of the 'Phags-pa edition. From this one can calculate the length of the entire book to have been approximately seventy folios.

It is not beyond reason, I think, to hope that more fragments, or perhaps even a complete copy of this unique publication, might be found somewhere in Central Asia.

The fragment in question, T III D 322:D 1 of the Berlin Turfan Collection, is reproduced in facsimile on pages 55 and 56 of Professor Haenisch's publication. The folios have inadvertently been reversed, so that page 10 is on page 56 and page 11 on page 55. The size of the original is given as 28 × 21 cm. The pages are divided in half, with ten lines on each side. In the middle appear in characters *pa shih* – a phonetic representation of the title to help the Chinese craftsmen and bookdealers to identify the work – and the page number in Chinese numerals. Every third line begins higher than the intervening lines and coincides with the beginning of a stanza.

Page 10 contains the seven last stanzas of the second chapter and page 11 gives the title of the second chapter and the first six stanzas of the third chapter. Unlike the Ligeti MS, which gives the chapter titles at the beginning of each chapter, this edition puts them at the end.

Although Professor Aalto has already treated the first ten lines of the recto page, I shall, for the sake of completeness, include them in this article.

In the following pages I give (a) a transliteration of the fragment, (b) a transcription, with the original length of the lines and the missing parts reconstructed, (c) a transcription of the corresponding passage in

⁷ Louis Ligeti, *Le Subhāṣitaratnanidhi mongol: un document du moyen mongol* (= *Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica*, VI) (Budapest, 1948).

the Ligeti MS, (d) a translation, (e) notes, and (f) an index of the words in 'Phags-pa script. The reconstructed words are marked by an asterisk.

TRANSLITERATION

The sign] indicates that the first part of the line is missing; the sign [, the last part.

D 1b – T III D 322

1.]-ya-ri-yan-q[
2.]i-yer-t'e-ji-[
3.]u-sud-ha-ran * do[
4.]r-di-ni-dur-šin-č'i-le[
5.]n-je-šin-č'i-le-k'un
6.]r-ber-'eu-lu-ba-ya-sun * do-rom-j[
7.]u-ma-·uè-lan * 'eo-·e-run-èr-de-mi-ye-[
8. su-è-le * sa-yid boq-da-sun-bel-ge-'nu-bo[
9. bi-li-gun-k'eu-č'u-ni-yer-o-luq-san-éd * 'eu-nen [
10. la-yi * no-qo-yi-qu-lu-qa-na-č'a-du-·su-ber * hi-č'u[
* * * * *
11. 'l-dar-bu-yu
12. neo-k'eor-se-·u-de-ri-t'e-gus-ba-ya-ji-·u-lu-·su[
13. i-nu-è-se-·u-buè * mo-ri-ni-yan-sa-yi-t'ur-č'[
14. jen-dur-beo-·ed-'eu-jes-k'u-leŋ-t'u 'eu[
15. yam-bar-yam-ba-ri-yar-no-yad-k'eu-·un * neo-k'eo[
16. ra-·su-è-le * t'e-re-t'e-re-k'u-yo-su-·ar-neo-k'...i[
17. 'euè-le-si-beu-t'u-·e-muè
18. sa-yin-boq-das-beu-k'u-qa-ja-ra * bu-su-mer-ge-di-k'en-je-seŋ-ge-r[
19. hoq-t'or-què-dur-na-ran-ur-qu-·su-è-le * ho-dud-o-lon-ber-[
20. su-'eu-lu-'eu-jeg-de-yu

D 1a – T III D 322

1. sa-yin-·eu-ge-t'u-'er-di-ni-yin-c'aŋ-ne-re-t'u-šas-ti-ra-č'a-s[
2. ni-o-no-què-neo-k'eo-·e-jeu-yil-da-·us-ba-yi
3. sa-du sa-du
4. ma-·uè-k'eu-·un-éd-t'u-bo-lu-·su-è-le * deu-led-t'e-ma-·uè-'[
5. bo-lu-yu * u-rus-qu-u-su-ni-k'er-ber-q[
6. ru-·u-k'u-u-ru-sun-buè
7. ma-·u-na-č'a-sa-yin-'bu-ri-qar-qa-·-su-ber * t'e-r[
8. bo-la-yi * bo-lo-ri-'er-di-ni-·er-'eoŋ-ge[
9. dur-k'eu-ru-·e-su-mun-'eoŋ-ge-·en-'eu-j[
10. muŋ-qa-·ud-'euè-le-si-sa-yi-t'ur-beu-t'u-·e-b[

* * * * *

11. buè-je-i-nu-beu-t'u-·eg-sen-bu-su-qo-ro * q[
12. qor-bo-lu-run * k'eu-·u-nu-u-ra-ni-yar-bo-luq[
13. sa-yi-dun-beu-t'u-·eg-sen-ê-ye-yi * ma-·u-i-ni-k'[
14. t'a-ri-ya-č'i-nu-hon-za-ra-jo-boq-san-t'a-ri-ya[
15.]qi-ra-·u-lu-muè
16.]un-²eo-·er-un-ge-mi-yen-b[
17.]bur-t'a-qi-i-deg-sen-qo-[
18.]r-č'i-muè
19.]e-dur-ya-bu[
20.]heu-n[

TRANSCRIPTION

a

1. -qun * č'ina omoqi]yariyanq[ayila·asu daqi * arslan
2. ni·ulesk'uè sedk'il]iyer t'ej[·eyu
3. sayidt'ač'a gemè/eriyu b]usud haran * do[radusač'a qami·a è/erik'un
4. * qaqaraqsan 'e]rdinidur šinč'ile[gdeyu * t'ülegsen
5. č'uč'alayi k'e]n je šinč'ilek'un
6. maqtaqsaniya]r ber ülu bayasun * doromj[ilaqda·asu ber ü-
7. lu k'ju mauélan * ö·erun êrdemiye[n sayit'ur a·a-
8. su éle * sayid boqdasun belge anu bo[layi
9. biligun k'üč'uniyer oluqsan éd * ünen éd t'abar k'emek'u bo-
10. layi * noqoyi quluqana č'adu·asu ber * hič'u[·uri jabqaqsanu
11. aldar buyu
12. nököör se·uderi t'egus bayaži·ulu·asu[* noyanu k'u sayin
13. inu ese·u buè * moriniyan sayit'ur č'[ime·esu éle * è-
14. jendur bö·ed üjšesk'uleŋt'u ü[lu·u buè
15. yambar yambariyar noyad k'ü·un * nököö[diyen ač'i·ariyan asa-
16. ra·asu éle * t'ere t'ere k'u yosu·ar nökö[ödj]i[nu * noyaniyan
17. üëlesi büt'u·emuè
18. sayin boqdas бүк'u qajara * busu mergedi k'en je seŋger[ek'un *
19. hoqt'orquédur naran urqu·asu éle * hodud olon ber [bö·e-
20. su ülu üjegdeyu

b

1. sayin ·üget'u 'erdiniyin c'aŋ neret'u šastirač'a s[ayin hara-
2. ni onoquè nökö·e jüyil da·usbayi

3. sadu sadu
4. ma·uê k'ü·un êdt'u bolu·asu êle * düledt'e ma·uê a[burit'u
5. boluyu * urusqu usuni k'er ber q[ari·ulu·asu * imaqt'a hu-
6. ru·u k'u urusun buê
7. ma·unač'a sayin aburi qarqa·asu ber * t'er[er]e jasadaq aburi k'emek'u
8. bolayi * bolori'erdini·er önge[le·esu ber * usun-
9. dur k'üru·esu mun önge·en üj[e·uluyu
10. muŋqa·ud üêlesi sayit'ur büt'u·eb[esu ber * öljêee
11. buê je (*) inu büt'u·egsen busu (*) qoro * q[aêin şilusun yon-
12. qor bolurun * k'ü·unu uraniyar boluq[san busu buê
13. sayidun büt'u·egsen êyeyi * ma·ui nik'[en da·undur ebdeyu *
14. t'ariyač'inu hon zara joboqsan t'ariya[ni * möndur nik'en da-
15. ·undur]qira·ulumuê
16. olanqin ma]·un ö·erun gemiyen b[usud harandur u·uruyu *
17. t'ura·un]burt'aqi idegsen qo[ši·u·an * ari·un qajar-
18. t'ur k'ič'i·eju a]rč'imuê
19. muŋqaq k'ü·uni üêl]edur yabu[·ulu·asu * üêlesi ebde-
20. ·ed mun ber qut'uyu *]hün[egeni qan ora sa·uluqsanu şil-

LIGETI

II 7a

sayid boɣdas-tur dorodus aran maɣulabasu ber *
 esergü qamiɣ-a ayimasqun * çin-a omoɣ-iyar-iyar
 qayilabasu daqi * arslan nigülesküj sedkil-iyer
 tejiɣeyü **

sayid-tača gem eriyü busud aran * dorodus-ača
 qamiɣ-a erikün * qaɣaraɣsan erdeni-dür sinjilegdeyü *
 tülegsen čučala-yi ken j-e sinjilekün **

II 7b

maɣtaysan-iyar ber ülü bayasun * doromjilaɣdabasu ber
 ülü kü maɣulan * öber-ün erdem-iyen sayitur abasu ele *
 sayid boɣdas-un belge anu bolaj **
 bilig-ün küčün-iyer oluɣsan ed * üneden tabar kemekü
 bolaj * noqaj quluɣan-a čadbasu ber * içigüri jabqaɣsan-u
 aldar buyu **

II 8a

nökör següder-i tegüs bayajıɣulbasu * noyan-u kü sayin

inu esegü buı * morin-ıyan sayitur čimebesü ele *
 eĵen-dür büged üĵesküleng-tü ülügü buı **
 yambar yambar-ıyar noyan kümün * nököd-ıyen açıbar-
 ıyar asarabasu ele * tere tere kü yosuıar nököd
 inu * noyan-ıyan üĵles-i bütügemüi **

II 8b

sayin boydas bükü ıaıar-a * busu merged-i ken
 ĵ-e senggerekün * oıtarıui-dur naran urıubasu
 ele * odud olan ber bügesü ülü üĵegdeyü **

III 1a

(blank)

III 1b

sayin üge-tü erdeni-yin sang neretü šastir-ača
 mungqay-ud-i onoqui ıutaıar jüıı **
 maıui kümün ed-tü bolbasu ele * düledte maıui
 aburi-tu boluyu * urusqu usun-i ker ber
 qariıulbasu * imayta uruıu kü urusun buı **

III 2a

maıun-ača sayin aburi ıarbasu ber * tere
 ĵasadaı aburi kemekü bolai * bolor-i erdeni-ber
 önggelebesü ber * usun-dur kürbesü mön öngge-
 ben üĵügülüıyü **
 mungqay-ud üıles-i sayitur bütügebesü ber *
 öııeı-e buı ĵ-a inu bütügegsen busu *
 qoroqai-yin silüsün yongqor bolur-un *
 kümün-ü uran-ıyar boluısan busu buı **

III 2b

sayid-un bütügegsen ey-e-yi * maıun aran nigen
 daıun-dur ebdeyü * tariyačın-u on sara ĵobaısan
 tariyan-i * möndür nigen daıun-dur qariıulumui **
 olangkin maıun öber-ün gem-ıyen * busud aran-dur
 uıuruyu * turaıun burtaı-i idegsen qosııuban *
 ariıun ıaıar-tur kičigeıü arčimui **

III 3a

mungqay kümün-i üjle-dür yabuγulbasu * üjles-i
 ebdeged mön ber γutuyu * ünege-i qan or-a
 sayluγsan-u siltaγabar * nököd-i jobqayad mön
 ber alaγdaγuγuj geku **

II 1b

sayin üge-tü erdeni-yin sang neretü šastir-ača
 sayin aran-i onoquj nöğüge jüjl **

TRANSLATION

[Even if the lowly are malicious towards the excellent saints,
 In return, how shall they be angry?]
 Even though the wolf¹ howls with arrogance,
 the lion nourishes (him) with a compassionate mind.

Other people seek fault in the good ones.
 Why should they seek it in the lowly?
 A broken jewel is investigated;²
 Who would investigate a burnt fire-brand?

If one keeps one's virtue well,
 Not rejoicing at having been praised,
 Nor becoming discontented even when insulted,
 (It is) the sign of the excellent saints.

Goods found by the power of the mind
 Are called true goods and chattels.³
 Even if the dog and rat⁴ sate themselves,
 (They have) the reputation of having lost shame.

If (a prince) fully enriches his retinue,⁵
 Is it not (to) the good⁶ of the prince?
 If he adorns his horse well,
 Will it not also become beautiful to the master?⁷

In whatever manner a princely person
 Through his own grace⁸ protects his retainers,

In exactly such a manner his retainers
Will fulfill the work of their prince.

In a place where the excellent saints are,⁹
Who will pay attention to the other sages?¹⁰
Whenever the sun rises in the sky,
Even though there be many stars, they are not seen.

The Second Chapter, "On Knowing Good People," from the *çāstra*
called *The Treasury¹¹ of the Well-Worded Jewel¹²* has ended.

Sadu Sadu¹³

Whenever a bad person gains possessions,
His character becomes surpassingly worse.
However one diverts¹⁴ flowing water,
It will only flow downwards.

Even if one produces¹⁵ a good character from evil people,
That one is called a counterfeit character.
Even if one lends luster to a crystal with a jewel,
When it gets into water it shows its own color.

Even if fools fulfill¹⁶ their deeds well,
It is by luck, it is not their own doing;
When the saliva of the worm¹⁷ becomes silk thread,¹⁸
It (does) not become it through the skill of man.

The concord wrought by the excellent,
Bad people¹⁹ destroy in an instant.²⁰
The farmer's crop, over which he has worried²¹ for a long time²²
The hail turns²³ back (into dust²⁴) in an instant.

Usually bad people throw
Their own faults on other people.
In clean earth the jackdaw²⁵ assiduously works
At cleansing the bill with which he has eaten filth.

If one sends foolish people on a job,
They first destroy the work and then themselves.

By reason of having elected a fox as king,²⁶
[Having tormented his retainers, he himself will be killed, it says.]²⁷

NOTES

1. *č'ina; cf. činā (wolf) in *Mukaddimat al-Adab*. The Mongolian text should read činunčar/činučar (jackal) to correctly translate the Tibetan *lce spyang*; cf. Ye-shes rdo-rje, *Mkhas pa rgya mtsho blo gsal mgul rgyan* (Corpus scriptorum mongolorum, vol. 4), p. 157: *lce spyangs* = *cho-notshar*; and Sumatiratna, *Mun sel sgron me* (= *Corp. script. mong.*, vol. 6), p. 604: *lce spyang* = činučar/činunčar. *Tabun jüil-ün üsüg-iyer qabsuruysan manju ügen-ü toli bičig* (Peking reprint, 1957), p. 4949, translates *lce spyang* as "hyena".

2. šinč'ilegdeyu; It is curious to note that the word is spelled with a č' in this fragment. In *The Mongolian Monuments in ḥP'ags-pa Script*, p. 130, instead of šinč'ilegdeju, read šinč'ilegdeyu. The gloss refers to this fragment.

3. In keeping with the ancient cast of the language, I have reconstructed the word t'abar instead of t'avar. The Ligeti MS also reads *tabar*. Note on line 4 of fragment TM 4D 130 of the Turfan Collection (reproduced on p. 12 of *Mongolica der Berliner Turfan-Sammlung*, II): *ed tabar*.

4. Where the Mongolian text has *quluqana* (rat = Tib. *byi ba*), the Tibetan text reads *byi bla* (cat); another xylograph of the Tibetan version belonging to the Far Eastern Library, University of Washington, also has *byi la id*.

5. *nök'ör se·uder(i)* Tib. 'khor (retinue), cf. *Secret History*, *nokor se'uder* (Gefährte-Schatten, unzertrennlicher Gefährte).

6. The Tibetan text here reads *che ba* (greatness, might), whereas the Mongolian has *sayin*.

7. Tib. *rta la rgyan du byas pa de | bdag po nyid la mi mdzes sam |* "Won't that which has been done by way of adornment on the horse also beautify the master?" (Lit. "Won't (it) also be beautiful to/on the master himself?").

8. The Ligeti MS here reads *ačibar-iyar*, which is no doubt a mistake for *ačibar-iyān*; I reconstruct the 'Phags-pa accordingly.

9. *sayin boqdas*; Note the inconsistency in agreement. In the Ligeti MS the adjective inconsistently agrees with the noun in number.

10. I here translate *busu merged(i)* as "other sages", rather than "non-sages", in accordance with the Tib. *mkhas pa gzhan dag*. The adjective and noun are not in agreement here either.

11. *c'aŋ*; A Chinese loanword. The word was Mongolized as *sang*.
12. In contrast to other 'Phags-pa sources where the word *erdini* is extant, it is here spelled with *e* rather than *é* initially.
13. The word *sadu* = Skt. *sādhu* (good) has here been written twice in order to fill a line and retain the three-line form of the stanza.
14. Lit. "causes to return", Tib. *bzlog* id.
15. *qarqa·asu ber* should probably not be causative. The Ligeti MS has *yarbasu ber* "even if comes forth", which corresponds to the Tib. *byung yang* and fits better syntactically.
16. *büt'u·eb[esu]*; A *b* is clearly visible after the *e*. Is this conv. cond. in *-basu/-besü*, which is very uncommon in 'Phags-pa, a *lapsus calami*?
17. *qoro * q[aè]*; By mistake a punctuation mark has been put in the middle of the word.
18. *yong[gor]*; The Tibetan version reads *dar skud* "silk thread". Kowalewsky translates *yongqor* as "pure silk", and Lewicki, in the vocabulary to the *Hua-yi yi-yu*, translates it as "raw silk". In Khalkha *yonxor utas* means "silk thread", which leads me to believe that the real meaning of the word is the unwoven silk thread.
19. Note the unusual form *ma·ui*.
20. "in an instant" = *nik'en da·undur*, Lit. "in (the space of) a voice".
21. *'bad pa* (to raise, take care of, exert oneself) is here translated by *jobo-* (to worry, suffer over).
22. *hon zara*; Lit. "year (and) month", Tib. *lo zlar* lit. "in year (and) month", I have translated loosely as "for a long time".
23. *qira·ulumuè* is a mistake for *qari·ulumuè*; the Ligeti MS has *qariyulumuä* "turning back" and the Tib. reads *rlog* id.
24. The Mongolian translator has omitted translating the words *rdul du*, "into atoms, dust". (The Ligeti MS reads *rtul du*, a mistake.)
25. **t'ura·un*; Ligeti MS *turayun*; the word is identified in *Tabun jüil-ün üsüg-iyer qabsuruysan manju ügen-ü toli bičig*, p. 4163, as *turuu*, translated by Tib. *bya rog mo* (raven); Manchu *turaki* (jackdaw) [cf. Evenki *turaki* (crow, gray and white), *Evenkiisko-russkii slovar'*, Moscow, 1958, p. 402]; Turki *taḫanak*. Radloff [*Wörterbuch der Türk-Dialekte*, Vol. III, p. 1150] gives *tokunak* (jackdaw), *tokunak kaya* id. Modern Uigur also has the word: *toqunaq qaya* (jackdaw = Russ. галка) [*Russko-uigurskii slovar'*, Moscow, 1956, p. 187].
26. Lit. "By reason of having caused a fox to throne-sit." The word *or-a* is here not to be construed as being in the dat.-loc. case; *or-a sayu-* is rather a single concept "to throne-sit, to rule as king" similar to the Manchu phrase *gurun te-* "to reside as a nation, to settle down as a

27. “it says”; referring to the fable from which the aphorism is taken.

GLOSSARY

The glossary is in the same alphabetical order as the glossary in N. Poppe's *The Mongolian Monuments in hP'ags-pa Script*.

Words completely reconstructed are preceded by an asterisk. Partial reconstructions are enclosed in brackets. Verbal and nominal inflectional endings are in parentheses.

After every entry I have given, as far as possible, the forms of the gloss culled from the following sources:

1. Erich Haenisch, *Wörterbuch zu Manghol un niuca tobca'an* (Leipzig, 1939).
2. Marian Lewicki, *La Langue mongole des transcriptions chinoises du XIV^e siècle; Le Houa-yi yi-yu de 1389, II: Vocabulaire-index* (Wrocław, 1959).
3. N. N. Poppe, *Mongol'skii slovar' Mukaddimat al-Adab* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1938).
4. N. Poppe, *The Mongolian Monuments in hP'ags-pa Script* (Wiesbaden, 1957).
5. Written Mongolian form of the word.
6. Colloquial Khalkha, mainly from *Mongol'sko-russkii slovar'*, A. Luvsandendev, ed. (Moscow, 1957).

$[a(\cdot a]su)$ to be a7-8// 1. a^- , 2. a^- , 5. a^- id.

aburi character, nature b7// 1. *aburi*, 2. *aburi*, 3. *aburi*, 5. *aburi*, 6. *avir id.*

**aburit'u* having a character by// 1. aburitu, 2. aburitu, 3. aburitu, 5. aburitu, 6. avirtai id.

aldar fame, reputation all// 1. *aldar*, 5. *aldar*, 6. *aldar* id.

anu their a8// 1. ano, 2. anu, 4. anu, 5. anu id.

a[rč'i(muè)] to clean b18// 1. *arci-*, 3. *arči-*, 5. *arči-*, 6. *arči-* id.

**ari·un* clean, pure b17// 2. *ari'un*, 3. *ari'ūn*/*ariyun*, 4. *ari·uè*, 5. *ariyun*, 6. *ariun* id.

**arslan* lion a1// 1. *arslan*, 2. *arslan*, 3. *arslan*, 4. [*ar*]*slan*, 5. *arsalan*/
arslan, 6. *arslan* id.

[asa]ra(·asu) to protect, keep, guard a16// 1. asara-, 2. asara-, 3. asara-
id., 5. asara- to have pity, 6. asra- to guard, serve, care.

bayaĵi·ulu(·asu) to make rich a12// 3. *bayaĵi-* to become rich, 5. *bayaĵiyul-* to make rich, 6. *bayažuul-* id.

bayas(un) to rejoice a6// 1. *bayas-*, 2. *bayas-*, 3. *bayas-*, 4. *bayas-*, 5. *bayas-*, 6. *bayas-* id.

belge mark, sign a8// 1. *belge* certificate, pawn, proof, 2. *bälgä* sign, mark, 3. *belge*, 5. *belge*, 6. *beleg* id.

ber concessive and generalizing particle a5, a6, a7, a8, a10, a19// 1. *ber*,
2. *bär*, 3. *ber*, 5. *ber* id.

**ber* id. b20//

bilig(un) intellect a9// 2. *biliktü* prudent, sage, 3. *bilik* intellect, 5. *bilig* id.,

6. *bilig* talent

bolayi is b8// 1. *boluyi*, 2. *bolai*, 4. *bo[layi]*, 5. *bolai*/*bolui* id.

b[olayi] is a8

[bo]layi is a9-10

bolu(q[san]) to become b12// 1. *bol-*, 2. *bol-*, 3. *bol-*, 5. *bol-*, 6. *bol-* id.

bol(urun) id.

bol(uyu) id.

bol(u·asu) id.

bolor(i) rock-crystal b8// 2. *bolor*, 5. *bolor*, 6. *bolor* id.

boqdas saints a18// 1. *bohda* holy, wise, 4. *boqdas/boqt'as* saints, 5. *boydas*,

bogdos id.

boqdas(un) id. a8

bö·ed to be (here a strengthening particle) a14// 1. *bo'et*, 4. *bö·ed*,

5. *büged*, 6. *bögööd* id.

[bö·ë]su to be a20//

buè is a13, b6, b11// 1. *bui*, 2. *bui*, 5. *bui*, 6. *bii* id.

**buè* id. a14, b12

burt'aq(i) filth, impurity b17// 3. *burtaq*, 5. *burtay*, 6. *burtag* id.

busu negative particle, other a18, b11// 1. *busu*, 2. *busu*, 3. *busu*, 5. *busu*,

6. *bus* id.

**busu* id. b12

[b]usud others b16// 1. *busut*, 2. *busut*, 4. *busud*, 5. *busud*, 6. *busad* id.

b[usud] id. a3

buyu to be a11// 1. *buyu*, 2. *buyu*, 5. *buyu* id.

bük'u to be, exist a18// 1. *bugu*, 2. *bügü*, 4. *bük'u*, 5. *bükü* id.

büt'u·e(b[esu]) to complete, perform, fulfill b10// 1. *bute'e-*, 3. *bütē-*,

5. *bütüge-*, 6. *bütee-* id.

büt'u·e(gsen) id. b11, b13

büt'u·e(muè) id. a17

c'ay treasury, storehouse, granary b1// 1. *cang/zang* id., 2. *tsay* public

granary, 4. *c'ay* land taxes, 5. *sang* treasure, treasury, storehouse,

6. *sang* id.

č'ad(u·asu) to be satiated, to glut oneself a10// 1. *cat-*, 2. *čat-*, 3. *čat-*,

4. *č'ad-*, 5. *čat-*, 6. *cad-* id.

č'i[me(·esu)] to adorn a13// 3. *cime-*, 4. *č'ime-*, 5. *čime-*, 6. *čime-*, id.

**č'ina* wolf a1// 1. *činō*, 2. *čino*, 3. *činā/čānā*, 5. *činu-a*, 6. *čono* id.

**č'uč'ala(yi)* firebrand a5// 5. *čuč'ali*, 6. *cucal* id.

- **daq* again, even, too, also a1// 1. *taki*, 2. *taki*, 5. *daki*, 6. *daxin* id.
- **da·un(dur)* voice, sound b13, b14–15// 2. *da'un*, 3. *da'un*, 5. *dayun*, 6. *duu(n)* id.
- da·us(bayi)* to be finished b2// 1. *dao'us-* to end, fulfill, endure, 3. *da'ūs-*, to be finished, 5. *dayus-* id., 6. *duus-* to end, finish.
- d[oradus(ač'a)]* lowly, inferior people a3// 1. *dōromji(n)* vulgar people, 3. *doradu/doratu* lower, baseness, vileness, 5. *dooratu* inferior, insignificant
- doromj[ilaqda(·asu)]* to be humiliated, insulted a6// 3. *doramji-* to offend, insult, 5. *doromjila-*, 6. *doromžlo-* id.
- düledt'e* more, the more b4// 1. *dulet*, 2. *dülätä*, 5. *tüledte* id.
- **ebde(yu)* to break, destroy b13// 1. *ebde-*, 3. *ebde-* id., 4. *ebdere-* to break, be damaged, 5. *ebde-* to destroy, 6. *evde-* id.
- **ebde(·ed)* id. b19–20
- [*ʔe*]rdini(*dur*) jewel a4// 4. *ərdini/ərtini*, 5. *erdini/erdeni*, 6. *erdene* id.
- ʔerdini(·er)* id. b8
- ʔerdini(yin)* id. b1
- əd* goods, property a9// 5. *ed*, 6. *ed* id.
- ədt'u* with goods, property b4
- [*ə*]jen(*dur*) lord, master a14// 1. *ejen*, 2. *äžän*, 3. *ejen*, 4. *ejen*, 5. *ejen*, 6. *ezen* id.
- ële* generalizing particle a8, a13, a16, a19, b4// 1. *ele*, 2. *älä*, 5. *ele* id.
- ərdem(iye[n])* virtue a7// 1. *erdem* ability, 3. *erdem* science, knowledge, ability, 5. *erdem* virtue, ability, knowledge, 6. *erdem* science, ability, erudition
- **ə/eri(k'un)* to search, look for a3// 1. *eri-*, 2. *äri-*, 3. *eri-*, 5. *eri-*, 6. *ere-* id.
- **ə/eri(yu)* id. a3
- ése·u* is it not? a13// 1. *ese-u* id.
- əye(yi)* concord, peace b13// 1. *eye*, 2. *äyä*, 5. *ey-e*, 6. *eye* id.
- **gem* vice, defect, sin a3// 4. *gemud*, diseases, 5. *gem*, defect, sin, 6. *gem* id.
- gem(iyen)* id. b16
- **hač'i(·ariyan)* grace, benefit, merit a15// 1. *hači*, 2. *hači*, 4. *hač'i*, 5. *ači*, 6. *ač* id.
- haran* people a3// 1. *haran*, 2. *haran*, 3. *haran*, 4. *haran*, 5. *aran* id., 6. *aran*, plebeian, commoner
- **haran(dur)* id. b16
- haran(i)* id. b1–2

hič'u[·uri] shame a10// 1. *hiče-* to be ashamed, 2. *hičä-* id., 5. *ičegüri* shame, 6. *ičgüür* id.

hodud stars a19// 1. *hodun* star, 2. *hodun* id., 3. *hodud*, stars, 5. *odun*, 6. *od(on)* id.

hon year b14// 1. *hon*, 2. *hon*, 3. *hon*, 5. *on*, 6. *on* id.

hoqt'orquë(dur) heaven, firmament, sky a19// 1. *hohtorhu* empty, 2. *ho-χtorχu/-χui* id., 5. *oxtoryui* firmament, sky, 6. *ogtorgui* id.

[hu]ru·u downwards, downstream b6// 1. *huru'u*, 3. *hurü/urü*, 5. *uruyu*, 6. *uruu* id.

hün[egen(i)] fox b20// 1. *hunegen*, 2. *hünägän*, 3. *hünegen*, 5. *ünege(n)*, 6. *iineg(en)* id.

ide(gsen) to eat b17// 1. *ide-*, 2. *idä-*, 3. *ide-*, 5. *ide-*, 6. *ide-* id.

**imaqt'a* always, only b5// 5. *imayta*, 6. *yamagt* id.

inu his a13, b11// 1. *inø*, 2. *inu*, 3. *inu*, 5. *inu* id.

i[nu] id. a16

**jabqa(qsan)* to lose a10// 1. *jabħa-*, 3. *jabqa-*, 5. *jabqa-*, to disappear, to be lost. 6. *zavxra-* id.

**jasadaq* counterfeit, false b7// 5. *jasaday*, 6. *zasdag* id.

je enclitic expressing doubt a5, b11, b18// 1. *-je*, 2. *žä*, 5. *ĵ-e/a*, 6. *-z* id.

jobo(qsan) to suffer, worry b14// 1. *jobo-*, 2. *žobo(laŋ)*, 3. *ĵoba-*, 5. *ĵoba-*, 6. *zovo-* id.

ĵüyil chapter, category, sort b2// 1. *ĵüyil(e)*, 2. *jüyil*, 5. *ĵüil*, 6. *züil* id.

**k'emek'u* to say, name, call a9, b7// 5. *kemekü* id.

k'en who a18// 1. *ken*, 2. *kän*, 3. *ken*, 4. *k'en*, 5. *ken*, 6. *xen* id.

[k'e]n id. a5

k'er ber if, however, in whatever way b5// 1. *ker ber*, 2. *kärbär*, 4. *k'er ber*, 5. *ker ber*, 6. *xerev* id.

k'ič'i·e(ĵu) to be zealous, take pains at b18// 1. *kici'e-*, 2. *kičä'ä-*, 3. *kičē-*, 5. *kičege-*, 6. *xičee-* id.

k'u strengthening particle a16, b1// 1. *ku/gu*, 2. *gü*, 5. *kü*, 6. *xüü/xö* id. *k'u* id. a7

**k'u* id. a12

k'üc'un(iyer) strength a9// 1. *gucu(n)*, 2. *güčün*, 3. *küčün*, 4. *k'üc'un*, 5. *küčün*, 6. *xuč(in)* id.

k'ü·un man, person a15, b4// 1. *gu'un*, 2. *gü'ün*, 3. *kü'ün*, 4. *k'ü·un*, 5. *kümün*, 6. *xün* id.

k'ü·un(u) id. b12

**k'ü·un(i)* id. b19

k'üru·esu to arrive b9// 1. *gur-*, 2. *gür-*, 3. *kür-*, 5. *kür-*, 6. *xür-* id.

[*maqta*(*qsaniya*)]*r* to praise a6// 2. *maχta*-, 3. *maqta*-, 5. *mayta*-, 6. *magta*-id.
ma·uè bad, evil b4// 1. *mao'ui*, 2. *ma'u*, 3. *ma'ū*, 4. *ma·uè*, 5. *mayu*/*mayui*,
 6. *muu* id.

ma·uèla(*n*) to be offended, discontented, malicious a7// 1. *mao'ula*- to
 sorrow, be upset, 3. *ma'uila*- to do evil, 5. *mayuyila*- to be offended,
 6. *muula*- to gossip, to blame

ma·ui see *ma·uè*, b13

ma·un(*ač'a*) evil ones b7// 1. *mao'un*, 2. *ma'un*, 5. *mayun* id.

[*ma*]·*un* id. b16

merged(*i*) wise men, the accomplished ones a18// 1. *mergan*, sg. 2.
märgän, sg., 4. *mergen*, sg., 5. *merged*, 6. *mergen*, sg., id.

morin(*ian*) horse a13// 1. *mori*(*n*), 2. *morin*, 3. *morin*, 5. *morid*, pl.,
 5. *morin*, 6. *mori*(*n*) id.

**möndür* hail b14// 2. *mündür*, 3. *möndür*, 5. *möndür*, 6. *möndör* id.

mun the very, same one b9// 1. *mun*, 2. *mun*, 3. *mön*, 4. *mün*, 5. *mön*,
 6. *mön* id.

**mun* id. b20

**muṇṇaq* fool, stupid b19// 1. *muṇḡah*, 2. *muṇḡax*, 3. *muṇṇaq* [sic],
 5. *muṇḡay*,

muṇṇa·ud pl. id. n10

naran the sun a19// 1. *naran*, 2. *naran*, 3. *naran*, 4. *naran*, 5. *naran*, 6.
nar(*an*) id.

neret'u called, with the name b1// 1. *neretu*, 2. *närätü*, 3. *neretü*, 4. *neret'u*,
 5. *neretü* id., 6. *nert*/*nertei*, famous

**ni·ulesk'uè* compassionate a2// 2. *nüläsküi* kindness, compassion, 5.
nigülesküi id.

nik'[*en*] one b13// 1. *nikan*/*niken*, 2. *nikän*, 3. *niken*, 4. *nik'en*, 5. *nigen*,
 6. *neg* id.

**nik'en* id. b14

noqoyi dog a10// 1. *noḡai*, 2. *noḡai*, 3. *noqai*, 5. *noqai*, 6. *noxoi* id.

noyad lords, princes a15// 1. *noyat*, 2. *noyat*, 3. *noyan*, sg., 4. *noyad*,
 5. *noyad*, 6. *noyod* id.

**noyan*(*u*) id., sg. a12

**noyan*(*ian*) id. a16

nök'[*öd*] retainers, companions a15// 1. *nokot*, 2. *nököt*, 3. *nöküt*, 5.
nököd, 6. *nöxöd* id.

nök'ö[*d(iyen)*] id. a15

nök'ör se·uder(*i*) followers, retinue, companions a12// 1. *nokor se'uder*,
 5. *nökör següder*, id.

nök'ö·e second, other b2// 1. *noko'e*, 2. *nök'ö'ä*, 5. *nöğüge*, 6. *nögöö* id.

**olayqin* usually, in general, the greater part b16// 1. *olonki(n)*, 2. *olaykin*, 5. *olangkin*, 6. *olonxi* id.

olon many a19// 1. *olon*, 2. *olon*, 3. *olon*, 4. *olon/olan*, 5. *olan*, 6. *olon* id.

olu(qsan) to find, get a9// 1. *ol-*, 2. *ol-*, 3. *ol-*, 4. *ol-*, 5. *ol-*, 6. *ol-* id.

[*omoq*](*iyarian*) arrogance, pride a1// 1. *omoh* bravery, 2. *omoχ* bravery, pride, 5. *omoy* pride, 6. *omog* id.

ono(què) to understand, comprehend b2// 1. *ono-* to count, 2. *ono-* to reflect, meditate, 3. *ona-* understand, 5. *ono-*, 6. *ono-* id.

ora throne, seat, place b20// 1. *oro(n)*, 2. *oro(n)* place, 3. *ora/orun/oran*, 4. *oran* id., 5. *oron* place, throne, 6. *oron* place

**öljée(e)* luck, good fortune b10// 1. *olje/oljei*, 2. *ölžäi*, 4. *öljée*, 5. *öljei*, 6. *ölzii* id.

önge[le·esu] to give luster, polish, clean b8// 5. *önggele-*, 6. *öngölö-* id.

önge(en) color b9// 1. *ongge*, 3. *önge*, 4. *önge*, 5. *öngge*, 6. *öngö* id.

ö·er(un) one's own a8, b16// 1. *o'erun*, 2. *ö'ärün*, 4. *ö·erun*, 5. *öberün*, 6. *öörüin* id.

qajar(a) ground, earth a18// 1. *hajar*, 2. *xažar*, 3. *yažar/qajar*, 4. *qajar*, 5. *yažar*, 6. *gazar* id.

**qajar(t'ur)* id. b17//

**qami·a* where? (here: how?) a3// 3. *qamā*, 5. *qamiy-a*, 6. *xaa/xaana* id.

**qan* khan, king, b20// 1. *han*, 2. *xan*, 4. *qan*, 5. *qan*, 6. *xaan* id.

**qaqara(qsan)* to split, crack a4// 3. *qayal-*, 5. *qayara-*, 6. *xagara-* id.

q[ari·ulu(·asu)] to cause to go back, to detour, to cause to return b5// 1. *hari'ul-*, 2. *xari'ul-*, 3. *qari'ül-*, 5. *qariyul-*, 6. *xariul-* id.

qarqa(·asu) to cause to come forth, to produce b7// 1. *harħa-*, 2. *xarħa-*, 3. *yaryā-/yarqa-*, 5. *yarya-*, 6. *garga-* id.

**qayila(·asu)* to cry, shout a1// 1. *hayila-*, 3. *qaiila-*, 5. *qayila-*, 6. *xaila-* id. *qira·ul(umuē)* = *qari·ul*. See note 25. b15

qoroq[aē(yin)] worm, insect b11// 2. *xoroχai*, 3. *qorayai/qoruyai*, 5. *qoroqai*, 6. *xorxoi* id.

qo[ši·u(·an)] beak, bill b17// 1. *hoši'u(n)*, 2. *xoši'un*, 5. *qosiyun*, 6. *xošuu(n)* id.

quluqana rat, mouse a10// 1. *huluħana*, 2. *xuluħana*, 3. *qulyuna*, 5. *quluyan-a*, 6. *xulgana* id.

**qut'u(yu)* to be spoiled b20// 5. *yutu-*, 6. *guta-* id.

sadu = Skt. *sādhu*, see note 14. b3

sayid the good, noble ones, good, pl. a8// 1. *sayit*, 2. *sayid/t*, 4. *sayid*, 5. *sayid* id., 6. *said*, minister

**sayid*(*t'ač'a*) id. a3

sayid(un) id. b13

sayin good a18, b1, b7// 1. *sayin*, 2. *sayin*, 3. *sain/sayin*, 4. *sayin*, 5. *sayin*, 6. *sain* id.

**sayin* id. a12

sayit'ur well a13, b10// 1. *sayitur*, 2. *sayitur*, 5. *sayitur*, 6. *saitar* id.

**sayit'ur* id. a7

sa'ulu(qsan) to seat b20// 1. *sa'ul-*, 2. *sa'ulχa-*, 5. *sayul-*, 6. *suulga-* id.

**sedk'il(iyer)* thought, mind a2// 1. *setkil*, 2. *sätkil*, 3. *setkil*, 5. *sedkil*, 6. *setgel* id.

senger[e(k'un)] to busy o.s. with, pay attention to a18// 1. *senggere-*, 3. *sengere-*, 5. *senggere-* id.

se·uder(i) shadow, see *nök'ör* a12// 1. *se'uder*, 2. *sä'üdär*, 3. *se'üder*, 4. *se·uder*, 5. *segiüder*, 6. *süüder* id.

šastir(ač'a)·Skt. *čāstra* b1// 5. *šastir*, 6. *šastar* id.

šilusun saliva, b11// 1. *šilusun*, 5. *šilüsün*, 6. *šüls(en)* id.

šinč'i[legde(yu)] to be examined a4// 5. *šinžile-*, 6. *šinžle-* id.

šinč'ile(k'un) to examine a5

**t'abar* goods, chattels a9// 1. *tabar* valuables, 5. *tabar/tavar* chattels, goods, 6. *tavaar* id.

t'ariyač'in(u) farmer b14// 1. *tariyažin*, 3. *tari'āči*, 5. *tariyači*, 6. *tariačin* id.

t'ariya[n(i)] crop b14// 1. *tariyat*, pl., 2. *tariyan* cultivated land, 3. *tari'ān*, grain, crop, 4. *t'ariyan*, 5. *tariyan*, 6. *taria(n)* id.

t'egus perfect, complete a12// 1. *teguš*, 2. *tägüs*, 4. *t'egus*, 5. *tegüs*, 6. *tögs* id.

t'eji[·e(yu)] to nourish, feed, rear a2// 1. *teji'e-* id., 2. *täžä'ül-* to cause to rear, 3. *tejē-* to rear, 5. *tejiye-* to rear, nourish, 6. *težee-* id.

t'ere that, that one a16// 1. *tere*, 2. *tärä*, 3. *tere*, 5. *tere*, 6. *ter* id.

t'er[e] id. b7

**t'ura·un* jackdaw, crow b17// 5. *turayun/turuu* id.

t'üle(gsen) to burn a4// 1. *tule-*, 3. *tüle-*, 5. *tüle-*, 6. *tüle-* id.

usun(i) water b5// 1. *usu(n)*, 2. *usun*, 3. *usun*, 4. *usu/usun*, 5. *usun*, 6. *us(an)* id.

[*usun*](*dur*) id. b8–9

uran(iyar) art, craft b12// 2. *uran*, artisan, 3. *uran* craft, 5. *uran*, 6. *ur(an)* id.

urqu(·*asu*) to rise, grow, appear a19// 1. *urḥu*-, 3. *urḡu*-/*hurḡu*, 5. *urḡu*-, 6. *urga*- id.

urus(*qu*) to flow b5// 1. *urusha*-, make flow, 3. *urus*-, 5. *urus*-, 6. *ursa*- id.

[*üel*]*e*(*dur*) work, deed b19// 1. *uiyile*, 2. *üyilä*, 3. *üile*, 4. *üele*, 5. *üile*, 6. *üil* id.

üeles(*i*) id., pl. a17, b10

**üeles*(*i*) b19

üjegde(*yu*) to be seen a20// 1. *ujekde*-, 3. *üjegde*-, id., 4. *üje*-, to see, 5. *üjegde*- to be seen, 6. *üzegde*-, id.

üj[e·ulu(*yu*)] to show b9// 1. *uju*·ul-, 2. *üžä*·ül-, 3. *üje*·ül-, 5. *üjegül*-, 6. *üzüül*- id.

üjesk'uleḡt'u beautiful, handsome a14// 1. *ujesguleng* appearance, 3. *üjesküleḡtütü*, 5. *üjesküleḡtütü*, 6. *üzesgeleḡt* id.

ülü neg. used with verbs a6, a20// 1. *ulu*, 2. *ülü*, 3. *ülü*, 4. *ülü*, 5. *ülü*, 6. *ül* id.

ü[lu·u] neg. interrogative a14// 1. *ulu*·u, 4. *ülü*·u, 5. *ülügü* id.

ünen truth, true a9// 1. *unen*, 2. *ünän*, 3. *ünen*, 4. *ünen*, 5. *ünen*, 6. *ünen* id.

yabu[·ul(*u·asu*)] to send b19// 1. *yabu*·ul-, 2. *yabu*·ul/*yabuḡul*, 3. *yabu*·ül-/*yaba*·ül-, 4. *yabu*·ul-, 5. *yabuḡul*-, 6. *yaviul*- id.

yambar how, what kind a15// 1. *yambar*, 2. *yambar*, 3. *yamar*, 5. *yambar*, 6. *yamar* id.

[*yoḡ*]*qor* silk thread b11-12// 2. *yoḡḡor* raw silk, 5. *yongqor* pure silk, 6. *yonxor utas* silk thread

yosu(·*ar*) manner, rule, custom a16// 1. *yosu*(*n*), 2. *yosun*, 4. *yosun*, 5. *yosun*, *yos*(*on*) id.

zara moon, month b14// 1. *sara*, 2. *sara*, 3. *sara*, 4. *zara*, 5. *sara*, 6. *sar* id.

·*üget*·*u* having words b1// 1. *uge* word, 2. *ügä*, 3. *üge* id., 5. *ügetü* having words, 6. *ügtei* id.

NOTE:

Mr. Bosson's article was written a few weeks after he had received Professor E. Haenisch's edition of the Turfan fragments, and was sent to the publishers of the *Central Asiatic Journal* in midsummer 1959. The publication of the article was delayed through no fault of its author. In the meantime Professor Pentti Aalto published his article on the same subject. Although Mr. Bosson's article appears only now, it is absolutely independent of Prof. Aalto's works.

NICHOLAS POPPE

A NOTE ON THE MONGOLIAN BOOKS IN THE GEST CHINESE RESEARCH LIBRARY, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

by

DAVID M. FARQUHAR

University of Maryland

The Mongolian collection in the Gest Chinese Research Library of Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, which I recently looked over, cannot be called an outstanding one, but it contains a number of items which should be of considerable interest to Mongolists.¹

The most surprising find was a complete set of the printed Mongolian *Ganjur* in 108 volumes and one volume of colophons, indices and supplements.² This is the second copy of the Mongolian Buddhist canon to be discovered in the United States, the other copy being the property of the Harvard-Yenching Institute at Harvard University. The Princeton *Ganjur* is superior in almost every respect: it is carefully printed and in an excellent state of preservation. The Harvard *Ganjur* is rather poorly printed, some pages have faded badly, and about 30 per cent of the volumes have suffered from damage by moisture and fungus – a few volumes to the extent that the text is destroyed. The very important volume of colophons, “vol. 109”, is missing in the Harvard copy, but is virtually complete in the Princeton set.³ At the end of this volume has been added as a supplement the Mongolian translation of the “larger” *Śūraṅgama-sūtra* in ten chapters (182 folios) with an Imperial preface in 5 folios dated 1763.⁴ Its full Mongolian title is *Tegünčilen iregsed-ün niyuča-yi бүтүгекүй удq-a ilede olqui-yin šiltayan qamuy bodhi-satuwanar-un dalai metü yabudal-i üjügülügsen burqan-u usnir bayatur-a yabuyči*

¹ I am grateful to Professor Frederick Mote, Department of Oriental Languages, Princeton University, and Dr. Howard C. Rice, Jr., Chief, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library, for making it possible for me to examine the Gest Collection.

² Catalogued by L. Ligeti, *Catalogue du Kanjur mongol imprimé* (Budapest, 1942).

³ Ligeti, *op. cit.*, pp. 330–345. The only missing part is the Imperial preface in Chinese (17 folios).

⁴ Baron A. von Staël-Holstein, “The Emperor Ch’ien-lung and the larger *Śūraṅgama-sūtra*,” *H.J.A.S.*, I, 1 (1936), p. 142.

yeke kölgen sudur, or for short simply *Bayatur-a yabuyçi* (Tib. *dpa' bar 'gro ba*).⁵

Under the rubric C-513 Gest No. 2164 are fragments of three different works, one of which is of great interest. It is an almost complete block-print of the *sūtra* known usually by its short Tibetan title, *Thar pa čhen po* (Mo. *Yekede tonilyayçi*).⁶ This book, reckoned to be one of the earliest Peking block-prints (1650), has been known only from the defective copy in The Royal Library in Copenhagen (*M-73* or *K-Mong.-504-2°*), which has been carefully described by Ove K. Nordstrand in this journal.⁷ The Princeton copy lacks folio 20 of the first chapter (33 folios); folio 1 of the middle chapter (37 folios); and folios 1 and 30 of the last chapter (30 folios). In spite of these lacunae and the fact that the paper is quite stained and fragile, the book is in good condition, the text is legible, and no special care is required in handling it. The Princeton text differs from the Copenhagen text in that it has no Chinese pagination. I do not know whether the Chinese pagination was added for the Copenhagen print or cut away for the Princeton print, but a detailed comparison on the basis of photographs will perhaps enable interested students to establish a priority among them.

The other works included in Gest No. 2164 are more fragmentary and less interesting. One consists of eight folios of a manuscript *Qutuy-tu pancarakša kemekü tabun sakiyan neretü yeke kölgen sudur*, written in red and black and dating apparently from the 18th century.⁸ Finally, there is a manuscript in red and black (apparently of late date) of the *sūtra* *Yekede quriyaysan erdini oki-yin toytayal nere-tü*,⁹ which lacks folios 1-34, 207, and 242 out of a total of 247 folios.

The Gest collection contains in addition a number of Mongolian-Manchu-Chinese lexical works and similar polyglot dictionaries. Most of these books are of little interest to the Mongolist, although some have considerable value as reference works.¹⁰

⁵ The Harvard-Yenching Institute also has this "supplement", and the Tibetan and Manchu versions published at the same time as well.

⁶ Walther Heissig, *Die Pekinger lamaistischen Blockdrucke in mongolischer Sprache* (Wiesbaden, 1954), No. 1 (p. 8).

⁷ "Some notes on the discoveries made during the restoration of a Mongolian block-print in the Royal Library, Copenhagen", *C.A.J.*, III, 4 (1958), pp. 256-266.

⁸ See Heissig, *op. cit.*, No. 9.

⁹ See Heissig, *op. cit.*, Nos. 3 and 38.

¹⁰ Almost all of these works may be found listed in the union catalogue of Manchu books in the National Library of Peking and the Palace Museum, *Man-wen shu-chi lien-ho mu-lu* (Peking, 1933), compiled by Li Te-ch'ü and Yü Tao-ch'üan (see Teng and Biggerstaff, *An Annotated Bibliography of Selected Chinese Reference Works*, pp. 61-62).

ZU EINIGEN TIBETISCHEN NAMEN
UNTER DEN HOLZSCHNITTEN IM 'KHRUŃS RABS
GSOL 'DEBS NOR BU'I PHREŃ BA SKU
BRŃAN DAŃ BČAS PA

von

R. O. MEISEZAHL

Bonn

W. Heissig hat in seinem Aufsatz, „Materialien zum Druck- und Übersetzungswesen der Mongolen, I: Eine lamaistische Klosterdruckerei der K'ang-hsi Zeit bei den ostmongolischen Aukhan,¹ die tibetischen Namen unter den Holzschnitten, welche die Rückseiten der ersten 6 Blätter der Druckschrift 'KhruŃs rabs gsol 'debs nor bu'i phreŃ ba sku brŃan daŃ bčas pa schmücken, transkribiert. Der schlechte Druck hat in vereinzellen Fällen zu Lesefehlern geführt, die ich hier berichtigen möchte. Ich lese:

Bl. 1, links: rje bcun 'Jam pa'i dbyaŃs statt ~ ~ ~ ~ byaŃs. Das Tibetische entspricht nach dem tibetisch-sanskritischen Glossar *Ńe bar mkho ba'i legs sbyar gyi skad bod kyi brda' kã li'i phreŃ bsgrigs Ńo mchar nor bu'i do šal žes bya ba*² (ed. Bacot), pp. 55b, 54a: *bhaṭṭāraka Mañju-ghoṣa*.

Bl. 1, rechts: Man muss *Ńes don dbyaŃs sgrog* für *des non dbaŃs srog* lesen, weil *des non* und *dbaŃs srog* beide sprachlich unverständliche Formen sind. Für *Ńes don*, ein in der tibetisch-buddhistischen Scholastik sehr häufiger Begriff, gibt Nagao³ *nītārtha* an. Das tibetische Wörterbuch *dGe bśes čhos kyi grags pas brcams pa'i brda dag miŃ chig gsal ba* (Peking, 1957) umschreibt *Ńes don* mit *don dam pa* = *paramārtha*, auch *virṭi*,⁴ und mit *don dam bden pa* = *paramārthasatya*, d.h. absolute Wahrheit. Nach Das, *Tibetan-English Dictionary*, p. 644, ist *Ńes don* ein Ausdruck für *stoŃ Ńid*⁵ = *śūnyatā*. *dbyaŃs sgrog*s erscheint im *Ńo mchar nor bu'i do šal*, p. 120b, mit den Sanskrit-Äquivalenten *udgāṭr*⁶ und *madhuka*.⁷ Das

¹ *Central Asiatic Journal*, V (1960), p. 165.

² Abgekürzt *Ńo mchar nor bu'i do šal* oder *Rin po čhe'i do šal* = (*Adbhuta*)*ratnaniṣka*.

³ Gadjin M. Nagao, *Index to the Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* (Tokyo, 1958), p. 139.

⁴ Nach *Ńo mchar nor bu'i do šal*, p. 81a.

⁵ *stoŃ Ńid* erscheint im Tanjur vor dem Namen *sToŃ Ńid TiŃ 'jin* (*rdo rje*).

⁶ = *udgāṭar*, d.h. derjenige Hauptpriester, der das Sāman singt.

⁷ Eine Art von Barde.

genannte tibetische Wörterbuch umschreibt mit *sbrañ bu zig la'añ* oder schlicht *dbyañs byed*.

Bl. 2, Mitte: Lies *sa skyoñ* für das unverständliche ~ *skyod*. *Ño mchar nor bu'i do šal*, f. 182b, gibt *kšmāsāla*, recte °*pāla* = Hüter der Erde, für *sa skyoñ* an.

Bl. 3, links: Ein besseres Bild des Heiligen (*siddha*), über dessen Leben *Deb sñon*, II. 986–8, einige lesenswerte Angaben macht, bringt Lokesh Chandra's *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary*, p. 1052, s.v. *Thod smyon bsam grub*.

Bl. 3, Mitte: Ich lese auch *Bra sgom Čhos kyi rdo rje*, doch ist *m* in *sgom* unsicher. Der Klostername wohl eine Variante zu *Brag sgom*, der im *Deb sñon*, II. 938, genannt wird.

Bl. 3, rechts: Lies 'Bri *guñ* 'Ĵig rten mgon po für Bri ~ 'jig ~ ~. Der Name erscheint im *Deb sñon*, I. 306, II. 565, ohne Bezeichnung des Stammklosters 'Bri *guñ*.⁸ Ist identisch mit 'Bri *guñ* (auch *khun*) Rin po čhe oder 'Bri *guñ* Čhos rje, schlicht 'Bri *khun pa* (1143–1217), den *Vibhūti-candra* wegen seines Wissens als eine Inkarnation des grossen *Nāgārjuna* verehrte.⁹

Cordier, *Catalogue du Fonds Tibétain*, II, p. 87, nennt einen 'Ĵig rten mgon po als Verfasser des Hevajratantextes *De kho na ñid sñan ba zes bya ba*¹⁰ mit der Einschränkung, dass der Bodhisattva *Avalokiteśvara* als eigentlicher Autor anzusehen sei. Der dKar čhag des Peking Tanjur, p. 29a⁵, zitiert weder den einen noch den anderen Namen, sondern begnügt sich mit der knappen Angabe *byañ čhub sems dpas mjad pa* = vom Bodhisattva verfasst. Leider fehlt auch hier 'Bri *guñ*.

Als bedeutsamere Quelle erweist sich der Katalog der 64 *bsTod pa sna chogs* Texte, der die Einleitung des ersten Bandes des *Čo ne* Tanjur abschliesst.¹¹ Es heisst hier nämlich, f. IIIB³:

bsam gyi mi khyab pa'i bstod pa | bstod pa las 'das par bstod pa | bla na med pa'i bstod pa | 'phags pa rje bcun 'jam dpal gyi don dam par bstod pa | rje bcun 'phags pa 'jam dpal gyi sñiñ rje la bstod pa | gnas čhen po brgyad kyi mčhod rten la bstod pa | gnas čhen po brgyad kyi mčhod rten la bstod

⁸ *Deb sñon*, II.563: Čhos rje 'Ĵig rten mgon po.

⁹ *Deb sñon*, II.596–601.

¹⁰ Das Werk ist in folgenden vier Tanjur-Ausgaben enthalten: *Čo ne*, rGyud, ta 156b⁷–169b² (Meisezahl 178); *sDe dge*, ib., ta 154a²–166a⁵ (Tohoku 1293); *sNar thañ*, ib., za 484a⁶–498b⁵; *Peking*, rGyud 'grel, za 550b⁸–565a⁵ (Cordier, XXI.69; Otani 2416 [Bd. 56]). *dKar čhag*: *Čo ne* 182a¹, *sDe dge* 346b⁴, *sNar thañ* 30b⁶, *Peking* 29a⁵.

¹¹ *Čo ne*, *bsTod chogs*, ka, f. Va⁷: *bstod pa sna chogs kyis skor la drug ču re bži bzugs so*. Der Marginaltitel *bsTod chogs* – aber häufiger infigiert *bsToť* – ist nicht **Stotragaṇa* zu übersetzen, sondern **Vicitrakastava* (°*stuti* oder °*stotra*). Vgl. Čhos 'byuñ čhen mo (Bu ston gSuñ 'bum, Bd. ya), f. 166b⁶: *bstod pa sna chogs kyi skor la*.

*pa phyi ma | mjad pa bču gñis chul la bstod pa dan brgyad ni slob dpon
klu sgrub kyi mjad pa | 'di 'ga' žig gis klu sgrub dan | 'ga' žig gis 'bri guñ
'jig rten gsum mgon gyis mjad par bsad |*

Ich glaube, dass wir 'Bri guñ 'Jig rten gsum mgon mit 'Bri guñ 'Jig rten mgon po identifizieren dürfen. Die acht Schriften sind folgende:

(1) *bSam gyi mi khyab pa'i bstod pa* = *Acintyastava*, belegt in: Čo ne, *bsTod chogs*, ka 87a⁶–89b⁷ (Meisezahl 19)¹²; *sDe dge*, ib., 76b⁷–79a² (Tohoku 1128); *sNar thañ*, ib., 84b⁶–87a⁴; *Peking*, ib., 88b³–91a⁴ (Cordier, I. 19; Otani 2019 [Bd. 46]). *dKar čhag*: *sDe dge* 399b¹, *sNar thañ* 16b⁴, *Peking* 15a¹.

(2) *bsTod pa las 'das par bstod pa* = *Stutyatīstava* in: Čo ne, ib., 89b⁷–90b⁷ (Meisezahl 20); *sDe dge*, ib., 79a²–b⁶ (Tohoku 1129); *sNar thañ*, ib., 87a⁵–88a⁴; *Peking*, ib., 91a⁴–92a³ (Cordier, I. 20; Otani 2020 [Bd. 46]). *dKar čhag*: *sDe dge* 399b¹, *sNar thañ* 16b⁴, *Peking* 15a¹.

(3) *Bla na med pa'i bstod pa* = *Niruttarastava* in: Čo ne, ib., 90b⁷–91a⁶ (Meisezahl 21); *sDe dge*, ib., 79b⁷–80a⁴ und *Jo bo'i čhos čhuñ* 189b⁶–190a⁴ (Tohoku 1130; 4557); *sNar thañ*, ib., 88a⁴–b²; *Peking*, ib., 92a³–b² (Cordier, I. 21; Otani 2021 [Bd. 46]). *dKar čhag*: *sDe dge* 399b¹, *sNar thañ* 16b⁴, *Peking* 15a¹.

(4) *'phags pa rJe bcun 'Jam dpal gyi don dam par bstod pa* = *āryaBhaṭṭāraka-Mañjuśrīparamārthastuti* in: Čo ne, ib., 91a⁶–92a¹ (Meisezahl 22); *sDe dge*, ib., 80a⁵–b⁵ (Tohoku 1131); *sNar thañ*, ib., 88b²–89a³; *Peking*, ib., 92b²–93a³ (Cordier, I. 22; Otani 2022 [Bd. 46]). *dKar čhag*: *sDe dge* 399b¹, *sNar thañ* 16b⁵, *Peking* 15a¹.

(5) *rJe bcun 'phags pa 'Jam dpal gyi sñiñ rJe la bstod pa* = *Bhaṭṭāraka-āryaMañjuśrīkaruṇāstotra*¹³ in: Čo ne, ib., 92a¹–93a² (Meisezahl 23); *sDe dge*, ib., 80b⁵–81b² (Tohoku 1132); *sNar thañ*, ib., 89a³–90a³; *Peking*, ib., 93a⁴–94a⁴ (Cordier, I. 23; Otani 2023 [Bd. 46]). *dKar čhag*: *sDe dge* 399b¹, *sNar thañ* 16b⁵, *Peking* 15a¹.

(6) *gNas čhen po brgyad kyi mčhod rten la bstod pa* = *Aṣṭamahāsthāna-caityastotra* I in: Čo ne, ib., 93a²–b⁴ (Meisezahl 24); *sDe dge*, ib., 81b³–

¹² R. O. Meisezahl, *The Tanjur of the Čo ne Monastery*. Cataloged from a negative microfilm copy of a xylograph brought back by J. F. Rock and now kept in the Library of Congress, Washington, with references to the *sDe dge*, *sNar thañ*, *Peking*, and *Žva lu gser khañ* recensions of the Tanjur. Vgl. Conference on American Library Resources on Southern Asia, Washington 1957, *Working Paper* No. 3 (Walter H. Maurer, "Primary Source Materials, the Location and Acquisition, with Particular Reference to Manuscripts, Texts and Translations"), p. 29, n. 4.

¹³ Der Sanskrittitel des Textes im Tanjur lautet *āryaMañjuśrībhaṭṭārakakarūṇāstotra*; *bhaṭṭāraka* unterbleibt in der Überschrift *'phags pa 'Jam dpal gyi sñiñ rJe la bstod pa bžugs*.

82a³ (Tohoku 1133); *sNar thañ*, ib., 90a³–b⁵; *Peking*, ib., 94a⁵–b⁷ (Cordier, I. 24; Otani 2024 [Bd. 46]). *dKar čhag*: *sDe dge* 399b¹, *sNar thañ* 16b⁵, *Peking* 15a².

(7) *gNas čhen po brgyad kyi mčhod rten la bstod pa phyi ma* = *Aṣṭama-hāsthānacaityastotra* II in: *Čo ne*, ib., 93b⁴–94a⁵ (Meisezahl 25); *sDe dge*, ib., 82a³–b³ (Tohoku 1134); *sNar thañ*, ib., 90b⁵–91a⁶; *Peking*, ib., 94b⁷–95b¹ (Cordier, I. 25; Otani 2025 [Bd. 46]). *dKar čhag*: *sDe dge* 399b², *sNar thañ* 16b⁵, *Peking* 15a².

(8) *mJad pa bču gñis chul la bstod pa* = *Dvādaśakāranayastotra-nāma* in: *Čo ne*, ib., 94a⁵–95a⁴ (Meisezahl 26); *sDe dge*, ib., 82b³–83a⁶ (Tohoku 1135); *sNar thañ*, ib., 91a⁶–92a⁴; *Peking*, ib., 95b¹–96a⁷ (Cordier, I. 26; Otani 2026 [Bd. 46]). *dKar čhag*: *sDe dge* 399b², *sNar thañ* 16b⁵, *Peking* 15a².

Es ist beachtenswert, dass der *dKar čhag* des *Čo ne* Tanjur zwei verschiedenen Überlieferungen in betreff der Autorenschaft kennt, d.h. er nennt den *slob dpon Klu sgrub* (= *ācārya Nāgārjuna*) als Verfasser der acht Hymnen und weist abschliessend darauf hin, dass über diese Frage Zweifel dahin bestünden, ob die Texte dem grossen indischen Philosophen oder dem Tibeter *’Bri guñ ’ġig rten gsum mgon* zuzuschreiben seien. Diese Streitfrage wird in den *dKar čhag* Texten zu den *sDe dge*, *sNar thañ* und *Peking* Ausgaben des Tanjur nicht gestellt. Da auch in den Kolophonen der fraglichen Werke lediglich *Klu sgrub* als Verfasser erscheint, kann man von einer späteren Ergänzung der *dKar čhag* Angaben über den Verfasser im Textkatalog des ersten Tanjur-Bandes der *Čo ne* Ausgabe sprechen.

Im *dKar čhag* des *sDe dge* Tanjur, f. 399b¹, schliesst übrigens der Text wie folgt:

mjad pa bču gñis kyi chul la bstod pa | phyag ’chal ba’i bstod pa | dmyal ba nas ’don pa’i bstod pa rnam slob dpon čhen po klu sgrub kyis mjad pa | rgya gar gyi mkhan po ti la ka dañ | lo cā ba pa chab ñi ma grags kyi ’gyur rnam so ||

sDe dge zählt demnach die Texte *Phyag ’chal ba’i bstod pa* (*Vandanāstotra*)¹⁴ und *dMyal ba nas ’don pa’i bstod pa* (*Narakodhārastotra*)¹⁵ zu dieser Hymnenreihe und nennt *mahācārya Nāgārjuna* als Verfasser der

¹⁴ *Čo ne*, *bsTod chogs*, ka 95a⁴–b⁴ (Meisezahl 27); *sDe dge*, ib., 83a⁶–b⁵ (Tohoku 1136); *sNar thañ*, ib., 92a⁴–b³; *Peking*, ib., 96a⁸–b⁸ (Cordier, I.27; Otani 2027 [Bd. 46]). *dKar čhag*: *sDe dge* 399b², *sNar thañ* 16b⁵, *Peking* 15a².

¹⁵ *Čo ne*, ib., 95b⁴–96b² (Meisezahl 28); *sDe dge*, ib., 83b⁵–84a⁷ (Tohoku 1137); *sNar thañ*, ib., 92b⁴–93b¹; *Peking*, ib., 97a¹–b⁷ (Cordier, I.28; Otani 2028 [Bd. 46]). *dKar čhag*, *sDe dge* 399b², *sNar thañ* 16b⁶, *Peking* 15a².

zehn Werke. Als Übersetzer erscheinen der indische *upādhyāya Tilaka* und der tibetische *loccha*¹⁶ *Pa chab Ņi ma grags*. Diese Namen sind mit weiteren ergänzenden Angaben auch im *Čo ne Tanjur* belegt, aber erst zum letztgenannten Text. Es heisst im ersten Tanjurband, f. IIIb⁵:

*dmyal ba nas 'don pa źes bya ba | slob dpon klu sgrub kyi mjad pa | dpał
ra sa ra mo čhe gcug la khañ du | groñ khyer dpe med kyi pañđi ta ti la ka
dañ | lo cā ba śākya'i dge sloñ pa chab ñi ma grags kyi 'gyur |*

= *dMyal ba nas 'don pa źes bya ba* (Narakoddhāra-nāma), verfasst von *ācārya Nāgārjuna* und übersetzt im Kloster *Ra mo čhe* zu *dPal Ra sa*¹⁷ von dem aus der Stadt *dPe med*¹⁸ stammenden *pañđita Tilaka*¹⁹ und von dem [tibetischen] *loccha, Śākyabhikṣu Pa chab*²⁰ *Ņi ma grags*.

Bl. 4, links: Lies *śākya* für *ša kya*. *'brum* hat hier keinen Sinn; lies *'bum*. Der Dargestellte ist vermutlich identisch mit *ācārya (Rin po čhe) Śākya 'bum (pa)*, 1265–1310, der uns im *Deb sñon*, II. 716–7, 747, begegnet. Für die Textlücke habe ich keine Erklärung.

Bl. 4, Mitte: Für *'Dul nag pa dPal ldan bzañ po* findet sich im *Deb sñon* die verständlichere Form *'Dul 'jin dPal ldan bzañ po*. Er war Abt des *sNar thañ* Klosters (Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts).

Bl. 5, links: *Mañ thos* ist Abkürzung für *Mañ du thos pa*, **bahuśruta*. Das genannte tibetisch-Sanskritische Glossar, f. 128a gibt *kṣisa* (= *kṣīpa*) und *śighraṃ* als Sanskrit-Entsprechungen an, die wenig überzeugen. Der eigentliche Name *Klu sgrub rgya mcho* dürfte eine erweiterte Form für *Klu sgrub* sein. Lalou, *Répertoire du Tanjur*, p. 174, gibt zwei weitere Beispiele an: *Klu sgrub sñiñ po* und *Klu sgrub nag po*.

Bl. 6, Mitte: Berichtige *ñi* für *ni* (Druckfehler). Weitere Missbildungen sind: pp. 178, vorletzte Zeile: *blo bzaž dge 'pel*, recte *Blo bzañ dge 'phel*; 179, Z. 1: *dkon mcog*²¹ *ř'igs med dbañ po*, recte *dKon mčhog ř'igs med dbañ po*; 179, Z. 7: *bkra' sis*, recte *bkra śis*; unverständlich ist *droñ řig* (Z. 3).

¹⁶ *lo cā ba*, abgekürzt *lo*, entspricht Sanskrit *loccha*; vgl. *Ņo mchar nor bu'i do šal*, f. 197a¹: *lo čhen čhos skyoñ bzañ pos mjad pa'i* = *mahālocchaDharmapālabhadreña kṛtasya*.

¹⁷ Das spätere *lHa sa*.

¹⁸ **Anupama* (?) in Nepal.

¹⁹ Zu ergänzen *Tilakakalaśa*.

²⁰ *De sñon*, I.344, ist *sPa chab* belegt.

²¹ Lies *mčog*, eine Form, die in Tun-huang Hss. sehr häufig belegt ist; als Variante tritt auch *čog* auf, die uns noch in den späteren Drucken begegnet, so z.B. im *dKar čhag* des Kanjur von *Šel dkar mi 'gyur rdo rje'i rjoñ*, f. 7a¹ *dKon čog sprin* = *Ratnamegha*. Die diesem Katalog zugrunde liegende Kanjur-Ausgabe ist nach dem Textbestand des mir zugänglichen *sNar thañ* Kanjur der Pariser Nationalbibliothek als ältere Rezension anzusehen. Beide gehören der gleichen Kanjur-Redaktion an.

ZUM STAMMESNAMEN DER SAYAJ

von

KARL H. MENGES

Columbia University

Die Sayaj sind wie die grosse Mehrzahl der süd-sibirischen Türkvolker ursprünglich keine Türken gewesen und haben entweder der süd-samojedischen (sajan-samojedischen) Gruppe oder den Jenisejern angehört. Das Wenige, was bisher über die Stämme, Herkunft und Namen der einzelnen süd-sibirischen Türkvolker bekannt ist, findet sich in Jokis ausgezeichneten Studie „Die Lehnwörter des Sajansamojedischen“, *MSFOu*, CIII (1952) und meinen Aufsätzen über die süd-sibirischen Türksprachen in dieser Zeitschrift zusammengestellt. In den genannten Arbeiten finden sich auch zahlreiche Verweise auf frühere Arbeiten zu diesem Problem.

Eine Reihe all' dieser Namen lässt sich eine Zeit lang zurückverfolgen, einige so weit, dass es möglich ist, zu sagen, zu welcher sprachlichen Gruppe sie gehört haben. Wie das bei Namen üblich ist, besonders bei weitgehendem Fehlen historischer Quellen, lassen sich nur ganz wenige wirklich etymologisieren, wobei hier natürlich die Gefahr der Volks-etymologie, auch gelehrter Volksetymologie, noch um ein Bedeutendes grösser als in Sprachen ist – wie z. B. in indogermanischen und semitischen –, deren Geschichte und Etymologie so wohl erforscht ist wie ihre Grammatik.

Der Name der Sayaj, deren bekannte Sprache zur Abaqan- oder Xaqas-Gruppe des süd-sibirischen Türkischen gehört, wird von Joki im oben citierten Werk, p. 259, als türkischer Herkunft bezeichnet. Joki führt das Wort *sayaj* unter Kamaš. *sâŷâj*, *sâŷâj k'ûza* als die Bezeichnung der „Sayaj-Tataren“ an und verweist hierbei auf seine eigenen Aufzeichnungen aus der Sprache der Qyzył, in der *Sayaj* ebenfalls die Sayaj (-Türken, -Tataren) bezeichnet. Dies ist natürlich kein genügendes Argument, denn der Name Sayaj liesse sich auch noch aus anderen süd-sibirischen Türksprachen nachweisen. In Radloffs *Wb.* fehlt dieser wichtige Stammesname, wie sehr viele andere. Der Name der Jakuten,

Saxā, ist nicht mit dem der Sağaj zu identifizieren, wie es von Pritsak in *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, p. 600 u., getan wird, denn das jakutische *Saxā* ist ja die jakutische Form des Namens, der auch in der Form **jaqu-t* (< **jaq-a-yu-t*?) vorliegt. Nichts zwingt aber zu der Annahme, dass der Stammesname der Sağaj türkischer Herkunft sein müsste; es ist im Gegenteil in Süd-Sibirien höchst wahrscheinlich, dass er nicht-türkisch, sonder süd-samojedisch oder jenisejisch ist. Läge eine samojedische Herkunft vor, so wäre sie sicherlich von Joki aufgedeckt worden. Deshalb möchte ich nunmehr eine jenisejische Etymologie vorschlagen, die ich schon vor ein paar Jahren gefunden habe: Jen.-Ostjak. (Ketó) *sāyaj*, *sayaj* (Castrén) „Eichhörnnest“, das eine Ableitung von Jen.-Ostjak. *sak'* (in der Mundart von Baxta des Dialekts von Imback *śak'*), Kott. *šaga* (Castrén), pl. Jen.-Ostj. *sāxan*, *sāyan*, Imback *śayen*, Kott. *šagán* (Castrén), „Eichhörnnest“ ist. Dies Wort kommt auch in Kai Donners Jenisej-Ostjakischen Materialien vor, die Joki in „Ketica“ (*MSFOu*, CVIII, 1955) herausgegeben hat: *sa'k*, *sāq'*, pl. *sān*, *sān* „Eichhorn“, *saydā sāyī.j* „Eichhornnest“ (p. 79); in *sāyī.j* liegt Kontraktion des von Castrén aufgezeichneten Diphthongs *-aj-*, also der älteren Form, vor. Als weitere Ableitung von *sak'* findet sich bei Donner & Joki noch *sānōābət*, *sānābət* „Eichhörnnest jagen“; über die Bildung dieser Ableitung liegen keine Angaben oder Mutmassungen vor; was das letztere anbetrifft, so ist es eine der seltenen unpraefigierten Verbalformen.

Hiermit dürfte Ernst Lewys Vergleich von Jenisej. *sāyaj* mit Tibet. *c'an* „Nest“ (cf. H. A. Jäschke, „Tibetan-English Dictionary“, p. 444 u.) und weiter A.-Chinesisch *dz'ay* „Nest“ (mod.-Chin. *č'ao*, Kanton *č'ao*, Hakka *c'au*, Wēn-Čzou *zoa*, Niņ-P'o *dzoa*, Korean. *so*, *č'o*, Jap. *sō*, *šō*, Annamit. *sau* [Wade-Giles, No. 520] in *Ungar. Jahrbüchern*, XIII, p. 295 hinfällig werden.

Dies deutete also auf die jenisejische Herkunft der Sağaj, weiterhin darauf, dass sie das Eichhörnnest als Totemtier gehabt haben müssen. Hierüber kann ich vor der Hand keine weiteren Untersuchungen anstellen, möchte aber nur auf das Vorkommen des türkischen Stammesnamens Küarik „Eichhörnnest“ verweisen; dies ist Qojbał *kōrek*, Karağas *kōrük*, *hōrük*, neben *hōrük* (Castrén) „gestreiftes Eichhorn, tamias striatus“, das auch in Nord-Amerika vorkommt und dort chipmunk (neben chipmonk) heisst, ein Lehnwort aus einer nord-amerikanischen Indianersprache. Die Angaben Castréns sind ungenau – was bei Castrén übrigens sehr selten ist –, denn „gestreiftes Eichhorn“ steht im Wörterverzeichnis, p. 97, während p. 139 das „fliegende sibirische Eichhorn“ *kōrük*, etc. und das gewöhnliche Eichhörnnest Qojbał, Soj. *tīn*, Karağas

tîn, dîn (< gem.-türk. *tijin*) heisst. In den Kapiteln, in denen Pallas von seinen Reisen im Abaqan- und Minusinsker Gebiet berichtet, von Anfang September 1772 (Französ. Ausgabe, Jahr II der Republik, vol. VI, § XIV, pp. 199 ff.), in denen er auch auf die Saɣaj zu sprechen kommt, erwähnt er 3 anscheinend jenisejische Stämme, die *Arintzi*, *Tinski* und *Isarintzi*. Die Wiedergabe der fremden Namen ist in der französischen Übersetzung gewöhnlich in der Form belassen, die sie in der deutschen Fassung haben; nur gelegentlich ist sie der französischen Aussprache angepasst, z. B. ou für u, aber durchweg – trotz Langlès – unsystematisch und sehr ungenau, was nicht nur daher kommt, dass Pallas selbst immer die russischen Formen zu Grunde legt, sondern auch daher, dass die einheimischen Namen durch des Verfassers Unkenntnis der Ursprungssprachen oft ohne russischen Prototyp an Ort und Stelle nicht immer genau notiert wurden. Die ersteren sind natürlich die аринцы, die jenisejischen Ara; die *Tinski* kommen weiter als „l'aïmak de *Tinski*, du Boug-Tiïn“ (p. 201) vor, und hier liegt ohne Zweifel das Türk. *tîn* „Eichhörnchen“ vor. Ob *boug* für Türk. *buɣu* „Hirsch“ oder *buɣa* „Ochs, Stier“ oder etwas ganz anderes steht, lässt sich ohne weitere Détails nicht sagen. In der russifizierten Form *Isarintzi*, d.h. исаринцы, dürfte ebenfalls eine Totem-Benennung vorliegen, die von Kott. *isar*, pl. *isatn* „Auerhahn“ (Castrén) gebildet ist. Für das Jenisej-Ostjakische haben Castrén sowie Donner & Joki nur *dit, dît* „id.“. Von den *Isarintzi* sagt Pallas, dass sie eine Gruppe von Stämmen darstellten, die sich seit einigen Jahren an den Bächen Tes und Jurba angesiedelt hätten, wo sie zusammen mit Qač(a)-Tataren lebten. Es scheint, dass die Qača-Tataren schon damals türkisch sprachen. Ihre Stammesältesten oder -führer haben nach Pallas meist den Titel князец oder *bašlyq*.

Die wissenschaftlich-ethnologische und linguistische Erforschung Sibiriens datiert erst seit M. A. Castrén, und vor den Reisen Klaproths, der über die Sprachen Sibiriens Untersuchungen angestellt und dadurch wenigstens Wörterverzeichnisse gesammelt hat, waren die Sprachen und Völker Sibiriens, soweit sie nicht den historisch bekannten türkischen und mongolischen Komplexen zugehörten, in tiefes Dunkel gehüllt. Deshalb sind abgesehen von Wörterlisten und einzelnen Wörtern, die von Reisenden schon vor Klaproth und Castrén geliefert wurden, deren Beschreibungen äusserlicher anthropologischer und ethnologischer Charakteristika oft von grossem Wert. So sagt z. B. Pallas von den Saɣaj, die bei ihm immer als „*Sagaik*“ erscheinen, dass sie hinsichtlich ihrer Gesichtszüge und Körpergestalt von den Qača-Tataren sehr verschieden seien. In dieser Hinsicht seien sie den Bältir und anderen

Tataren der Berge von Kuzneck sehr ähnlich, d.h. man treffe bei ihnen selten Gesichter an, welche die Charakterzüge der Kalmyken trügen; sie seien vielmehr wohlausgeprägte Tataren, ohne dass man bei ihnen irgendwelche Mischung feststellen könnte: sie hätten sehr starken Bartwuchs, seien sehr behaart am Körper, und grösser und sehniger als die Qača-Tataren. „Man könnte sogar glauben“, fügt Pallas hinzu, „dass diese Völkerschaften, die wilde und gebirgige Gegenden bewohnen, sich von der Mischung mit mongolischem Blut haben schützen können, die durchweg – darin soll man sich nicht täuschen – bei den Stämmen der Katschintzi-Tataren vorhanden ist“ (VI, 219). Weiterhin folgen noch einige Angaben über die SaĖaj wirtschaftlicher Art – reiche SaĖaj besitzen 80–100 Pferde, ebensoviele Kühe und einige Hundert Schafe; die SaĖaj betreiben auch Ackerbau, aber nur insoweit, als sie zu eigenem Verbrauch benötigen. Die Mehrzahl von ihnen ist christlich, aber Pallas hat auch šamanistische SaĖaj gesehen. Pallas' ethnologische Angaben sind sehr wertvoll für uns, sodass ich sie in enger Anlehnung an den französischen Text gebracht habe.

Pallas betont das weitgehende Fehlen der Charakteristika der Altajischen oder Hochasiatischen Rasse, die er als „kalmykisch“ und „mongolisch“ glossiert, und die starke Behaarung, die ein Zug ist, der zu weitreichenden Spekulationen Anlass gibt und ohne Zweifel weit nach Südwesten deutet. . . Der terminus „Tataren“ ist zu jener Zeit noch sehr vag und wird fast so frei verwendet wie von den russischen Eroberern Sibiriens, die summarisch alle Einwohner West- und Mittel-Sibiriens, auch viele Nord- und Ost-Sibiriens, einfach als „Tataren“ bezeichneten, was im Grund nur für die Türken und Mongolen zutrifft. Hier in dem anthropologisch, ethnologisch und linguistisch so komplizierten Gebiet um den Altaj herum beginnt man erst während der zweiten Hälfte des XIX. Jhdts. sich richtig auszukennen. Pallas' Beschreibung weist die SaĖaj einer Schicht zu, die weder uralisch, noch altajisch gesprochen hat: der jenisejischen.

Dass Gebirge als Rückzugs- und Fluchtgebiete ideale Réservoirs von sonst längst verschollenen Völkern und Sprachen darstellen, dafür liefern Kaukasus, Alpen, Pyrenäen, Hindukuš und Himalaja die besten Beispiele.

Radloff hält die SaĖaj und Bältir für türkisierte Jenisejer (*Aus Sibirien*, I, pp. 188 ff. der osman-türkischen Übersetzung von Dr. A. Temir, im Kapitel über die Kuznecker Tataren). Historisch ist nach Radloff fast nichts weiter von den SaĖaj bekannt, als dass sie sich im Jahr 1621 mit den damals sehr aggressiven, längst türkisierten QyrĖyz verbündeten.

Radloff hält sie deshalb für nicht-türkischer Herkunft, weil sie, von nomadischen, türkisch sprechenden Völkern umgeben, eine sesshafte Lebensweise haben und sich mit Handwerk und feinen Arbeiten in der Art von Kunstgewerbe befassen. Auch die jenisejischen Ara, ein eisenbearbeitendes Volk, werden von den Russen als „Schmiede-Tataren“ bezeichnet. Die Šor, ebenfalls Nachkommen von „Schmiede-Tataren“, unterscheiden sich nach Radloff in ihren Gesichtszügen vollkommen von den ganz mongolisch aussehenden Nachbarvölkern und -stämmen. Als besonders gewichtigen Grund für die ursprünglich jenisejische Natur der „Schmiede-Tataren“ führt Radloff die jenisejischen Flussnamen im Quellgebiet der Toń, d.h. im Gebiet der Saɣaj an, wo, wie er sagt, Dreiviertel aller Namen jenisejisch ist, wie z. B. *Päj-Säs* „Wind-Fluss“ < Jen. *päj* „Wind“ + *säs* „Fluss“, *Kam-Säs* „Pfeil-Fluss“, *Am-Säs* „Mutter-Fl.“, *Sin-Säs* „Schmutzfluss“, *Paj-Sas* „Latschenkiefer-Fl.“ (Jen. *faj* „Latschenkiefer, Arve, Zirm, Zirbel, pinus cembra“), desgleichen die Namen auf -*dät/-tät*, -*dat/-tat* nördlich der Kija, wie *Čerdat*, *Ardat*, *Irdät* (diese Namen lassen sich aber im Gegensatz zu den eben erwähnten nicht etymologisieren).

Die Saɣaj und Bältir müssen nach Radloff einmal ein grosses Volk gewesen sein, ehe die Qyrɣyz und Teleut vom Südwesten, vom Altaj, nach Nordosten, in die Täler von Abaqan und Jenisej und darüber hinaus vorgestossen waren. Die alten Xaqas, Qyrɣyz und Jenisejer müssen nach Radloff die oder einige der von den Chinesen schon für das VI. Jhdt. n. Chr. dort bezeugten blonden und grün- resp. blauäugigen Völker, wie die Du-ɣo, gewesen sein.

Während Radloff keine so spezifischen Aussagen über den anthropologischen Typ der Saɣaj macht, wie Pallas, lässt uns der Letztere über die Farbe der Haare wie auch der Augen und Haut bei den Saɣaj vollkommen im Unklaren, was zudem für einen Naturwissenschaftler höchst unerwartet und seltsam ist. Wenn es nicht heute noch blonde Abaqan-Türken (Xaqasen) gäbe, von denen ich selbst einen zur Weihnachtszeit 1928/9 in Leningrad gesehen habe, müsste man aus Pallas' Angaben schliessen, dass sich ihre Pigmentierung und Augenfarbe nicht wesentlich von der der umwohnenden Völker unterschieden hätte...

Die obige jenisejische Etymologie von Saɣaj ist ganz in Einklang mit Radloffs These vom jenisejischen Ursprung der „Schmiede-Tataren“ und stützt sie noch. Radloff nimmt an (op. cit., I, 210), dass schon im XVII. Jhdt. viele von den Saɣaj und „Schmiede-Tataren“ türkisch sprachen. Zu Radloffs Zeiten bestanden die Saɣaj aus folgenden Stämmen: I. Gruppe: Saɣaj, Turan, Saryɣ („gelb“ oder „blond“?), Irgit-Äčig, Qyj, Aba, Ťoda; Gruppe II: Qyrɣyz, Čätti Pürü („Sieben Wölfe“), Üs-Saɣaj

(Üs ist hier nicht „3“, sondern Flussname) und Tom-Saγaj („Saγaj an der Toṛm“); *op. cit.*, I, 209.

Es sei noch zusätzlich bemerkt, dass Pallas einen Stamm namens *Kaidintzi* in unmittelbarer Nähe der oben genannten *Tinski* oder *Boug-Tiin* erwähnt; diese *Kaidintzi* sind die von Castrén unter den Stämmen der Qojbał aufgezählten Qajdyn, welche Castrén dem Stamm der Baj der jenisej-ostjakischen Komponente der Qojbał zurechnet.

Einen spekulativen Zusatz zu meinen obigen Bemerkungen kann ich mir doch nicht versagen: nicht nur die europaeoide Blondheit und die damit zusammengehenden Charakteristika, sondern auch die bisher, wie mir scheint, unbeachtete starke Behaarung, wie sie Pallas betont, deuten weit nach Westen oder Südwesten. Bestehen da nicht irgendwelche Zusammenhänge mit dem Kaukasus – oder allgemeiner gesprochen, der mediterran-anatolisch-kaukasischen Welt? Deuten nicht auch gewisse rätselhafte Charakteristika des Jenisejischen, wie z. B. die merkwürdigen „gebrochenen“ Plurale der Nomina, die gewisse Parallelen in den daghestanischen Sprachen zu haben scheinen, und die noch immer nicht wirklich analysierte Struktur des jenisejischen Verbums, die ganz allgemein ans Basko-Kaukasische erinnert, weit nach Westen? Die Metallbearbeitung und das Kunsthandwerk, die aus dem Minusinsker Becken bekannt sind, haben schon früher durch den „Tierstil“ und noch andere Züge die Verbindungslinien nach Volga-Kama und schliesslich dem Kaukasus erwiesen. Das alles schliesst wohl einen sino-tibetischen Ursprung des Jenisejischen, nicht aber die Möglichkeit eines sino-tibetischen Sub-, Ad- oder Superstratums aus, von welchem gewisse Spuren durch W. Simon und Ernst Lewy aufgedeckt worden sind. Ein so bedeutender Linguist und Kenner vieler und sehr verschiedener Sprachen, wie der Letztgenannte, hat nunmehr in „Ketika“, *MSFOu*, CVIII, p. 125 gesagt: „Die Wichtigkeit des Ketischen als des Bindeglieds zwischen Kaukasus und dem fernen Osten kann nicht übertrieben werden.“

THE EARLY ISLAMIC HISTORY OF GHŪR

by

C. E. BOSWORTH

St. Andrews

I

The province of Ghūr in Afghanistan has long been one of the least-known regions of the eastern Islamic world, and our knowledge about its history, its rulers and its peoples still has many gaps in it. In the 12th and early 13th centuries a local family, the Shansabānīs, spread their power beyond the confines of Ghūr and became an international force; but their florescence coincided with the appearance of two other dynasties, those of the Khwārizmshāhs and the Mongols, who proved more powerful than the Ghūrids. Although the Ghūrids were to leave their mark on India, Ghūr itself now lapsed into obscurity, while its originally Iranian population became increasingly diluted with Turkish and Mongol pastoralists.

II

In 661 the Chinese T'ang dynasty organised the "Western Lands", which stretched beyond Khotan to the Persian frontier, into sixteen provinces of their empire. The Emperors regarded these lands as peripheral and as inhabited by barbarians; and although we have some Chinese material on Ṭukhāristān and on the Kabul and Gandhara areas, neither the Chinese administrative and geographical manuals nor the accounts of travellers like the Buddhist monk Huān-chuang throw any light on Ghūr at this period. The Arab and Persian geographers showed little interest in Ghūr. Until the 11th century it was a pagan land. It had no important urban centres for trade and industry, and no commercial routes crossed it, thereby necessitating the enumeration of roads and staging-posts characteristic of much early Muslim geographical literature. The anonymous author of the *Ḥudūd al-ʿālam* (completed 982-3) lived in the ad-

joining province of Gūzgān and served its princes, the Ferīghūnids. He asserts that they exercised suzerainty over Ghūr; but he shows no special concern to elucidate its geography.¹ The biographers had no interest in Ghūr because it produced no Muslim scholar or religious figure of even minor fame. The most Samʿānī can do is to name three scholars of Baghdad with the *laqab* "al-Ghūrī" and suggest that they were perhaps of Ghūrī origin; since they flourished in the 4th and early 5th centuries A.H., their forefathers may have been of servile origin, for pagan Ghūr long supplied Islam with slaves.² Without the history of the Shansabānī dynasty by their eulogist Minhāj ad-Dīn Jūzjānī, the *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*, written in 1260 for Sultan Nāṣir ad-Dīn Maḥmūd Shāh of Delhi, our knowledge of Ghūrī history in the early Islamic period would be meagre indeed. Even in the last century or so, travellers in Afghanistan have shown far less interest in the topography and antiquities of Ghūr than in those of the more accessible Sistan, Qandahar and Kabul regions. These last have the more obvious attractions of being historic corridors for the movement of peoples and ideas and of having connections with the classical Hellenistic, Buddhist and Indian worlds. Fortunately, the work of the French Archaeological Delegation in Afghanistan is now remedying this neglect of Ghūr.³

Ghūr lies in the west-centre of what is now Afghanistan, and comprises the basins of the upper Heri Rud, the Farah Rud, the Rud-i Ghor and the Khash Rud, together with the intervening mountain chains.⁴ These

¹ Tr. Minorsky, *G.M.S.* (London, 1937), pp. 110, 342.

² Samʿānī, *Kitāb al-ansāb*, *G.M.S.* facs. (London, 1912), f. 413a; Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-buldān*, ed. Wüstenfeld, III, p. 825.

³ It was not until the end of 1959, when this paper had been completed, that I was able to see a copy of A. Maricq and G. Wiet, *Le minaret de Djām. La découverte de la capitale des Sultans Ghorides (XIIe-XIIIe siècles)* (= *Méms. de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan*, XVI) (Paris, 1959), in which the discovery of Firūzkūh is described. M. Wiet contributes (pp. 31–54) an admirable historical survey of the dynasty in Ghūr which will replace that part of M. Longworth Dames' article in *E.I.*¹ which deals with the main branch of the family in Ghūr. M. Maricq's researches into the topography and political divisions of mediaeval Ghūr, illumined by what most earlier European writers on the subject have lacked, i.e. personal knowledge of the terrain, now satisfy many of the questions Minorsky had to leave unresolved in his survey of Ghūr, *H. al-a.*, 333, 342–4. In so far as the authors are primarily concerned with the political and military history of the Ghūrīd empire at the period of its greatest florescence, this present paper supplies a prolegomenon on the early history of the region and, in particular, its religious and cultural development.

⁴ The modern district of Ghūrī on the upper Qunduz, to the south-west of Khanabad and north of the Ghorband (cf. G. Jarring, *On the distribution of Turk tribes in Afghanistan*, = *Lunds Universitets Årsskrift*, N.F., Lund-Leipzig 1939, p. 16) is to be distinguished from the mediaeval province of Ghūr.

rise to over 10,000 feet and become considerably higher as they run eastwards to the Hindu Kush. Ghūr was difficult of access in mediaeval times and still is. The valley sides have deciduous woodlands and are often covered with mulberry and walnut trees, apricots and vines; they then rise steeply to the bare mountains. The valley bottoms are highly fertile, and already in the 10th century Iṣṭakhrī stressed the region's fruitfulness, with its streams, meadows and tillage. When in 1845 the French officer Ferrier penetrated into Ghūr – the pioneer traveller from western Europe in these parts – he recorded that “In the valley of the Heri-Rood we found a succession of camps and villages and cultivation of all kinds, with cattle, horses and camels in vast numbers on the pastures”. Today wheat and barley can be grown on the higher ground, while irrigation channels in the river bottoms conserve the waters of the melting snows; here, semi-tropical crops like rice are grown.⁵ After the Mongol invasions the pastoral element among the population increased; whereas in the Sāmānid, Ghaznevid and Ghūrīd periods the Tājīk inhabitants had possessed herds and had enjoyed some fame as horse rearers, they had been primarily agriculturists. It seems that the language of these Tājīks had considerable dialectical divergencies from the Persian spoken in Khurasan and from that familiar to the Ghaznevid Sultans; for his campaign of 1020 into Ghūr the Prince Mas‘ūd had to employ local interpreters.⁶

The accounts of the Ghaznevid campaigns in the early 11th century confirm Yāqūt's information that Ghūr had no towns of note, but only agricultural settlements and – most typical feature of the landscape – fortified places and towers (*qaṣr*, *qal‘a*, *ḥiṣār*, *kūshk*) in which a “bad-tempered, unruly and ignorant” people (*Ḥudūd al-‘ālam*, 110) could defend themselves. Under the Ghaznevīds and Ghūrīds, the inaccessibility of these strongholds made them favoured places for immuring political prisoners.⁷ The fortresses' commanding positions reflected the fragmentation of political power in Ghūr during this early period, a

⁵ Iṣṭakhrī, ed. de Goeje, 281; Ibn Ḥauqal, 2nd edn. of Kramers, 444; F. Spiegel, *Erânische Alterthumskunde* (Leipzig, 1871–8), I, 25–8; J. P. Ferrier, *Caravan journeys and wanderings in Persia, Afghanistan, Turkistan and Baloochistan* (London, 1856), pp. 238 ff.; G. Le Strange, *Eastern lands of the Caliphate* (Cambridge, 1905), pp. 416–17. Ahmad Ali Kohzad, “Along the Koh-i Baba and Hari Rud”, *Afghanistan*, VI–IX (Kabul, 1951–4), (6 parts) gives a good modern description based on the author's journey through Ghūr on horseback.

⁶ Iṣṭ., 281; Abū'l-Faḍl Baihaqī, *Tārīkh-i Mas‘ūdi*, ed. Ghānī and Feyyāz (Tehran, 1324), p. 117.

⁷ Baih., 12, 70, 229; Yāqūt, III, 168, 825; *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*, ed. W. Nassau Lees (Calcutta, 1864), p. 27, tr. H. G. Raverty (London, 1881), I, p. 115.

process aided by geography. There was no obvious centre from which the region could be dominated by a single ruler. Fīrūzkūh, eventually the capital of the whole of Ghūr, was originally founded by the Ghūrid ruler Quṭb ad-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 541/1146–7) as capital of the petty principality of Warshāda on the Heri Rud allotted to him by his father.⁸ So before the decay of the Ghaznevids and the rise of the Shansabānīs to more than local significance, Ghūr was a land of local chieftains, *derebeys*.

The route down the Heri Rud is the most direct between eastern Afghanistan and Khurasan, but because of the wildness of Ghūr, its paganism and the predatory activities of its people, it was little used for through traffic in early Islamic times. The routes from Kabul or Ghazna to Khurasan normally made long detours, either northwards across the Ghorband and through Balkh or southwards across the rivers and plains of Sistan via Qandahar and Bust.⁹ Under the Ghaznevids, the conversion of Ghūr began, and the military might of the early Sultans enabled them to exert considerable influence within it; but the Ghaznevid official Abū'l-Faḍl Baihaqī's memoirs show that Sultan Mas'ūd (421–32/1030–41) made his major troop movements between Ghazna and Khurasan by the "Bust road" or the "Balkh road". Indeed, the onset of winter weather made the transfer of large forces between Ghazna and Ghūr impossible.¹⁰ The central route through Ghūr was used only by small detachments of troops or to convey urgent messages or when some other important reason demanded speed; such occasions became more frequent as Seljuq pressure on Khurasan increased. After the final ruin of Ghaznevid power in the west at Dendānqān in 1040, the defeated Sultan and his entourage fled through Gharchistān and Ghūr to the castle of a friendly chieftain of northern Ghūr, Abū'l-'Abbās b. Abī'l-Ḥasan Khalaf, whose father had gone over to Mas'ūd's side when that prince had as governor of Khurasan led the Ghūr expedition of 411/1020 and had subsequently fought for the Sultan against the Qarakhanids (see below).¹¹

⁸ *Tab. Nās.*, 48, tr. I, 339. The fact that Fīrūzkūh lies on the northern limits of Ghūr, where it adjoins Gharchistān, and not in the centre of Ghūr, is explained by Maricq and Wiet, *op. cit.*, 61 ff.; see also below, n. 45. The eccentricity of this position caused many scholars in the past to dismiss the possibility of Fīrūzkūh's lying in the Heri Rud basin.

⁹ Kohzad, *op. cit.*, VI/1, 2–4, gives the mileage of the northern route from Kabul to Herat as 830, the southern one as 727, and the central one through Ghūr as 540 (across the Unai pass) or 628 (via Bāmiyān).

¹⁰ *Tab. Nās.*, 113, tr. I, 440.

¹¹ Baih., 523, 536 (where the journey between Ghazna and Nishapur via the Ghūr route is said to take 15 days), 538–9, 543–4, 626, 633.

As well as practising agriculture and banditry, the bellicose inhabitants of Ghūr specialised in the production of weapons and war equipment. The mountain massif of the Pamirs, the Hindu Kush and their outliers are all highly metalliferous, and as the name of one of Ghūr's chief fortresses, Āhengerān or Pul-i Āhengerān, "Blacksmith's boundary", implies, iron must have been readily obtainable and so worked in Ghūr. The *Hudud al-ʿālam* records that "from this province come slaves, armour, coats of mail and good arms".¹² When Masʿūd campaigned in Ghūr in 1020, the chieftain Abū'l-Ḥasan Khalaf brought him shields and cuirasses, and when the stronghold of the chieftain Warmesh-Pat of Jurwas was captured, a tribute of arms was levied. Later he employed Ghūrī officers in his service as specialists in siege-warfare; in 1035 two of them directed the defence of Tirmidh against the sons of the Qarakhanid ʿAlīṭigin with the aid of a powerful ballista (*ʿarrāda*). In the next century, the Shansabānī ruler of Ghūr, ʿIzz ad-Dīn Ḥusain (493–540/1100–46) used to send the Seljuq Sultan Sanjar as annual tribute armour, coats of mail, steel helmets and other war material, together with some of the ferocious watchdogs bred in Ghūr.¹³

III

The isolation and backwardness of Ghūr is seen in the persistence there of paganism long after the surrounding territories had become Muslim. Jūzjānī is certainly premature in asserting that there were already in the time of Yaʿqūb b. Laith (later 9th century) rival parties of Muslims and pagans among the chieftains of Ghūr who were continually at war. Describing it as a *dār kufr*, Iṣṭakhrī says he brings it into his purview only because there are a few Muslims there and because it is the biggest pagan enclave within the borders of Islam. He adds that the regions of Baghnīn (in Zābulistān), of the Khalaj, of Kabul and [Zamīn-] Dāwar are partly

¹² *H. al-ʿa.*, 110, 343; Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Tornberg, IX, 155; *Tab. Nās.*, 40, 356, tr. I, 321, II, 1047. The name "Āhengerān" is found in other parts of the Central Asian massif, e.g. an Āhengerān-Julgā between Tashkent and Andejān (*Bābur-nāme*, tr. A. S. Beveridge, London, 1912–21, pp. 90, 152, 161) and an Āhengerān in Qūhistān (C. E. Yate, *Khurasan and Sistan*, Edinburgh, 1900, p. 127). Togan, "Die Schwerter der Germanen", *Z.D.M.G.*, XC (1936), pp. 33–4, suggests a connection between metal-working in the Ghūr and Kabul areas and the skills of the Qarluq further north.

¹³ Baih., 115, 119–20 (= *Tab. Nās.*, tr. I, 325 n. ff.), 466; *Tab. Nās.*, 47, tr. I, 336–7. For the Ghūrī dogs, see also Nizāmī ʿArūḍī, *Chahār maqāla*, ed. Qazwinī and Muʿīn (Tehran, 1333), p. 96, E. G. Browne's Revised translation, *G.M.S.* (London, 1921), 68, and Muḥammad b. al-Munawwar, *Asrār at-tauḥīd fī maqāmāt ash-Shaikh Abī Saʿīd*, ed. V. A. Zhukovsky (St. Petersburg, 1899), 237.

Islamised, and that the rest of the people are *musālimūn*, i.e. in treaty relationship with the Muslims. The *Ḥudud al-ʿālam* describes the Ghūrīs as formerly pagan but now mostly Muslim. As Minorsky has pointed out, the stubborn resistance of the Ghūrīs in the first half of the 11th century against Ghaznevid attempts to control them shows that this claim was considerably exaggerated. Until this period, Ghūr retained its reputation as a pagan land which supplied slaves, mainly to markets in Herat and Sistan.¹⁴

When in the 7th century the Arabs had secured Khurasan, they began to look northwards and eastwards. Although their main efforts were directed against Transoxania and the upper Oxus valley, the region to the east of Herat was also probed at an early date. Ṭabarī records under 47/667 that “in this year Ziyād [b. Abīhi] sent al-Ḥakam b. ‘Amr al-Ghifārī to Khurasan as Amīr. He then raided the mountainous region of Ghūr and Farāwanda, brought them into submission by force of arms and conquered them. He obtained from them captives and a large amount of plunder”. This raid was apparently made from Merv or Herat.¹⁵

The expedition of 107/725–6 was a larger-scale operation. The governor of Khurasan, Abū Mundhir Asad b. ‘Abdallāh al-Qasrī, first raided Gharchistān and received the submission and conversion to Islam of its king. Then he attacked Ghūr, *Jibāl Herāt*, the land to the south of Gharchistān; the Ghūrīs hid their possessions in an inaccessible cave, but Asad let down men in crates (*tawābīt*) on the end of chains and recovered these valuables.¹⁶ This success tempted Asad to march into Ghūr a second time, and in 108–9/726–8 he turned aside from a campaign against the Turks in Khuttal and invaded Ghūr.¹⁷ Sporadic raids, unnoted by the historians, no doubt continued throughout the Umayyad period. We do

¹⁴ Iṣṭ., 245, 272, 281; I Ḥauq., 444; *Ḥ. al-ʿa.*, 110, 343–4; *Ṭab. Nāṣ.*, 38–9, tr. I, 317–18.

¹⁵ Ṭabarī, II, 84; Ibn al-Athīr, III, 380, under A.H. 47, quoting Ṭabarī but adding the detail, incredible for this early date, that the people of Ghūr had apostatised from Islam; cf. L. Caetani, *Chronographia islamica* (Paris, 1912 ff.), III, p. 517. Yaʿqūbī, *Historiae*, ed. Houtsma, II, 264, mentions a raid of al-Ḥakam and al-Muhallab to Herat and Gūzgān, but does not assign a date to it.

¹⁶ Ṭab., II, 1488–9; I.A., V, 102, under A.H. 107; cf. Caetani, *op. cit.*, V, 1347.

¹⁷ Ṭab., II, 1496–7; I.A., V, 103, under A.H. 108; cf. Caetani, *op. cit.*, V, pp. 1360, 1372. In the verses of Thābit Quṭna given in Ṭabarī, *loc. cit.*, the poet speaks of this second raid by Asad as essentially one against Turks. Eulogising the Arab leader, he says: “Groups of the Turks who live between Kabul and Ghūrīn came to you, since there was no place in which they might find refuge from you.” It is thus possible that the regions of Gūzgān or Bāmiyān, rather than the purely Iranian region of Ghūr, were the scene of these operations by Asad.

know that at some time before 121/739 Naṣr b. Sayyār's commander Sulaimān b. Ṣūl raided Gharchistān and Ghūr.¹⁸ But no permanent control, even of the lightest kind, was established over Ghūr at this time or in the succeeding century or so. The Arab commanders must have realised that a permanent occupation would be difficult and hardly worth the effort; there were much richer prizes to be gained in Transoxania and on the borders of India. Ghūr's value was as a reservoir of slaves, and these could best be obtained by occasional, temporary incursions.

In the Caliphate of al-Ma'mūn, it is recorded that when in 205/821 'Abd al-Ḥamīd b. Shubaib was appointed deputy in Sistan by the governor of Khurasan and Sistan, Ghassān b. 'Abbād, the local Khawārij were attacked and the provinces of Ghūr, Hind and Sind continually raided.¹⁹ At the end of the 9th century the Sāmānids expelled the Ṣaffārids from Khurasan, made the less aggressive successors of Ya'qūb and 'Amr their tributaries and extended a tenuous suzerainty over the region to the east of Ghūr; but Ghūr itself was left untouched. We know only of one successful expedition in this period. This was led by the Amīr Abū Ja'far, who came from the prominent Baihaq family of the Ziyādīs and had been made governor of Baihaq in 364/974-5 by Abū'l-Ḥasan Sīmjūrī. He brought back many captives to Khurasan, and, like the earlier incursions, this was a slave raid in force rather than an attempt to gain a foothold in Ghūr.²⁰ Sebūktigin, when governor of Ghazna and Zābulistān on behalf of the Sāmānids, is said to have made several attacks on Ghūr across the southern frontier facing Zamīndāwar and Bust, and the existence of one punitive expedition, in which Maḥmūd took part as a boy, has been uncovered by Nazim from the poetry of 'Unṣurī and Abū 'Āmir an-Najdī. In gratitude for his victory in 384/994 over the rebellious generals Abū 'Alī Sīmjūrī and Fā'iq Khāṣṣe, Sebūktigin was awarded the governorship of Balkh, Bāmiyān, Ghūr and Gharchistān by the Sāmānid Amīr Nūḥ b. Maṣṣūr; and Jūzjānī's source could imply that a tribute of money and arms was already levied on the Shansabānī chieftain of Āhengerān, Muḥammad b. Sūrī, in Sebūktigin's time.²¹ If any such control was in fact imposed, it can only have been

¹⁸ Tab., II, 1696; I.A., V, 179, under A.H. 121.

¹⁹ *Tārikh-i Sīstān*, ed. Malik ash-Shu'arā' Behār (Tehran, 1314), 176-7.

²⁰ Gardīzī, *Zain al-akhbār*, ed. M. Nazim (Berlin, 1928), 46-7; 'Alī b. Zaid, known as Ibn Funduq, *Tārikh-i Baihaq*, ed. A. Bahmanyār (Tehran, 1317), pp. 129-30. Baihaqī, *Tārikh-i Mas'ūdi*, 120, claims that Abū Ja'far made several incursions into Ghūr.

²¹ Nazim, *The life and times of Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Ghazna* (Cambridge, 1931), pp. 35-6; the anonymous *Nasā'im al-aṣḥār, kitāb fī alqāb al-wuzarā'*, Istanbul Persian Ms., Aya Sofya 3487 (cf. Storey, 1090), f. 74b; Ibn Haṣṣam, *Qīṣaṣ-i thānī*, quoted in *Tab. Nāṣ.*, 40, tr. I, 320.

transient; it was left to his son Maḥmūd of Ghazna to send a strong army under two of his best Turkish generals, Altuntash and Arslan Jādhib, against Āhengerān in 401/1011, the first of at least three expeditions into Ghūr during his reign (see below p. 127).²² The Ghūrīs in this period preyed on the caravans and travellers who passed just outside their frontiers, and levied transit dues on them, and it was this brigandage which enraged Maḥmūd and drove him into punitive measures.²³

Yet these major efforts were only an intensification of the smaller-scale warfare which must have gone on intermittently along the frontiers of Ghūr, the activities of ghāzīs and *murābiṭūn*. In the 10th and early 11th centuries, all the *thughūr* facing Ghūr were ringed with ribāts: at Ribāṭ-i Karwān on the borders of Gūzgān, at Ribāṭ-i Bazī in Gharchistān, at Bāgh-i Wazīr to the east of Herat. Maqdisī describes the southern frontier adjoining Zamīndāwar as especially strongly defended with "fully-equipped [or "permanently-stationed"?] guards" (*ḥurrās murattabūn*); at the ribāṭ of Dar-rang were kept arms, equipment and horses, and *murābiṭūn* resorted to it from all parts.²⁴

We have no knowledge about what constituted the paganism of Ghūr. Ghūr never formed part of the Sasanid empire, whose eastern boundary, as Marquart showed (*Ērānšahr*, 64, 70), was normally at Tālaqān, not much beyond Merv ar-Rūdh; and the absence of any important trade route from the west militated against the religions of the Persian empire being brought to it.²⁵ In the *Shāhnāme* the forces of Ghūr are depicted

²² 'Utbī, *at-Ta'rikh al-Yamīnī*, with commentary by Shaikh Manīnī, (Cairo, 1286), II, pp. 122–5, Persian tr. by Jurbādhqānī, ed. 'Alī Qawīm (Tehran, 1334), 199; I.A., IX, pp. 155–6; cf. Nazīm, *op. cit.*, pp. 70–3. This expedition may have been connected with events which were taking place in the adjoining land of Sistan. According to the *Tārikh-i Sīstān*, 358–9, the financial exactions of Ghaznevid officials there combined with famine and plague during the years 400–2/1009–12 to cause a rebellion against Maḥmūd. In the course of this the leaders (*mashāyikh*) of Sistan went in a deputation to Ghūr for help. So the expedition against Āhengerān may have had a further aim, to discourage the Ghūrīs from helping these rebels against the Ghaznevids.

²³ 'Utbī, *loc. cit.*; I.A., *loc. cit.*; 'Aufī, *Jawāmi' al-ḥikāyāt*, in Elliot and Dowson, *History of India*, II, pp. 195–6.

²⁴ Iṣṭ., 272; *Ḥ. al-'a.*, 107; Baih., 115, 633, cf. Maqdisī, ed. de Goeje, 309; *ibid.*, 305–6, following Marquart's reconstruction of "Dar-rang" from the text's *w.r.r.n.k.* ("Das Reich Zābul und der Gott Zūn vom 6–9 Jahrhundert", *Festschrift Eduard Sachau*, ed. G. Weil, Berlin, 1915, pp. 270–1).

²⁵ Jūzjānī, in his legendary account of the Shansabānī family's beginnings, speaks of a Jewish merchant in Ghūr who made an agreement with Amir Banjī (see below, p. 126) for the settlement of Jews within Ghūr (*Tab. Nās.*, 36–7, tr. I, 313–14; cf. W. J. Fischel, "The Jews of Central Asia (Khorasan) in mediaeval Hebrew and Islamic literature", *Historia Judaica*, VII, New York, 1945, pp. 40–2, who takes this story too seriously).

as fighting on Afrāsiyāb's side against Rustam.²⁶ Although Ṭukhāristān, Bāmiyān and Kabul were long strongholds of Buddhism, the same absence of routes and the mountainous topography prevented this faith from penetrating into Ghūr. However, the lands to the south of Ghūr, such as Zamīndāwar, Ghazna and Quṣḍār, adjoined the Indian world and until the 10th century were culturally and often politically part of it. Kabul, Ghazna and Bust were key-points in the commercial intercourse between the eastern Islamic world and India, and the geographers often designate them "the merchants' resort" or "the entrepôt" (*matjar, furḍa*) for India. The first two towns had in early Ghaznevid times colonies of Indian traders permanently resident there.²⁷ The Sāmānid slave general Alptigin came to power at Ghazna in 351/962 after defeating Abū 'Alī (or Abū Bakr) Lawīk or Anūk (?); but this dispossessed native ruler (who, despite the *kunya* attributed to him, can hardly have been a Muslim) was later given military help from Kabul, at that time part of the empire of the Hindūshāhī Rajahs of Waihand, and the influence here of this powerful Indian dynasty was not finally dispelled till Maḥmūd's time.²⁸ Zamīndāwar had once possessed a great shrine and pilgrimage centre devoted to the god Zūn or Zhūn, whose fame as the temple of Su-na penetrated even to China, but whose cult was clearly Hindu and not Buddhist in nature. Marquart plausibly suggested that the cult of Zūn might be connected with the famous shrine of the Sun-God Āditya at Multan, and that the temple of Zūn still existed in the latter part of the 9th century when Ya'qūb and 'Amr b. Laith conquered the region as far as Kabul and Bāmiyān.²⁹ The Arabian traveller Abū Dulaf (*floruit* mid-10th century) travelled within the Sāmānid dominions from Bukhara to Zamīndāwar and in his first *Risāla* seems to confuse reports of the House of Gold in Multan with those of the temple of Zūn.³⁰ If any outside

²⁶ Ed. Turner Macan (Calcutta, 1829), I, 296^{26/6}, tr. A. G. and E. Warner (London, 1902-25), II, 101.

²⁷ Iṣṭ., 245, 280; I Ḥauq.², 450; Maqd., 303-4; *H. al-'a.*, 111; Nazim, *Sulṭān Maḥmūd*, 163.

²⁸ *Tab. Nās.*, 7-8, tr. I, 71-4; Muḥammad b. 'Alī Shabānkāra'i, *Majma' al-ansāb fi't-tawārikh*, Istanbul Persian Ms., Yeni Cami 909, ff. 164a ff. (an especially full account of Sebūktigin's predecessors in Ghazna); Marquart, *Ērānshahr* (Berlin, 1901), p. 298; Nazim, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-30, 86 ff., Appx. I, 193; M. Longworth Dames, *E.I.*¹, Art. "Ghaznavids".

²⁹ "Das Reich Zābul", pp. 262-8, 272-4, 288 n. 2; cf. *Alberuni's India*, tr. Sachau (London, 1888), I, pp. 116-17, and Ibn an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, (Cairo, 1348), pp. 485-6. Minorsky, *E.I.*¹, Art. "Zūn", summarises Marquart.

³⁰ Cf. Minorsky, *Abū-Dulaf Mi'sar ibn Muḥalhil's travels in Iran (c. 950 AD)* (Cairo, 1955), pp. 16-17. Abū Dulaf's facility in invention and in claiming to have visited places he had never really seen were notorious in his own day (*ibid.*, 12); but he must

influences affected Ghūr, we might perhaps seek a diffusion-centre here. But we have no information on whether these Hindu influences came north-wards into Ghūr. The most that can be said is that the sources do reveal certain connections of the early Shansabānīs with India. According to 'Utbī, the chieftain Muḥammad b. Sūrī whom Maḥmūd of Ghazna defeated and deposed was a "Hindu", but this may be merely a general term for "pagan", especially as the majority of the heathen whom Maḥmūd came up against in his campaigns were of course Indians. However, Mustaufī and Mirkhwānd describe at this point in their accounts of the Ghūrīds the flight of Muḥammad b. Sūrī's grandson Sām to India, where he then took up residence in an idol-temple. His son Ḥusain became a Muslim, went on to Delhi and grew rich as a trader, carrying goods between India and Ghūr.³¹ These points do not add up to much, and unless more specific evidence comes to light, it is safest to argue from the silence of the sources that the paganism of Ghūr was of an indigenous variety and without outside connections. It is significant that there is no mention in the accounts of the Ghaznevid campaigns in Ghūr of the religious cults of the Ghūrīs, no stories of idol-breaking or the eradication of repugnant customs, even though for one of them, Mas'ūd's campaign of 1020, we have an especially detailed eye-witness account. So far as we can see, Ghūrī paganism had little positive content, but expressed rather the cultural backwardness of the region and its isolation from the surrounding higher civilisations.

IV

The Islamic history of Ghūr really begins with Maḥmūd of Ghazna (389–421/999–1030). Nevertheless, in the *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāsirī* and in the works of the other great eulogist of the Ghūrīds, Fakhr ad-Dīn Mu-bārakshāh, we see later efforts to give the Shansabānīs a glorious past and connect them with both Islamic religious life and history and also the Iranian pre-Islamic past. Jūzjānī first puts forward "as a great probability" that the eponymous founder of the dynasty, Shansab, was

have heard some local reminiscences of the shrine of Zūn, and it would be interesting to know how fresh these were in the minds of his Zamīndāwarī informants. I have not been able to ascertain what conclusions, if any, the latest translator of and commentator on the first *Risāla*, A. von Rohr-Sauer (*Des Abū Dulaf Bericht über seine Reise nach Turkestan, China und Indien*, Bonn, 1939) has reached on this point.

³¹ 'Utbī, *loc. cit.*; Mustaufī, *Tārīkh-i Guzīde*, G.S.M. facs. (London, 1910), pp. 406–8; Mirkhwānd, *Rauḍat aṣ-ṣafā*, ed. Rizā Qulī Khān (Tehran, 1270–4), IV, p. 241 (pagination supplied by me), cf. *Tab. Nāṣ.*, tr. I, pp. 322–3 n.

contemporaneous with the Caliph 'Alī and was converted to Islam by the Caliph personally. He received from him a *manshūr* for Ghūr, and this charter was jealously handed down within the Shansabānī family until the time of Sultan Bahrāmshāh of Ghazna (512–47/1118–52). Hence during the Umayyad period, according to Fakhr ad-Dīn, Ghūr had the proud distinction of being the only land where 'Alī's name was retained in the *khuṭba*. Jūzjānī then turns aside to trace the family's origin to the tyrant of Iranian mythology, Azhd Zahāk, whose descendants are said to have entrenched themselves in Ghūr when Zahāk's thousand-year dominion was overthrown by Ferīdūn.³² Returning to the Islamic theme, the Amīr Fūlād b. Shansab is given a part in the Abbasid revolution at Abū Muslim's side, and then there comes a more elaborate tale. The two rival families of Ghūr, the Shansabānīs and the Shīthānīs (or Shīshānīs, in the pronunciation of the Ghūrīs), both resorted to the court of Hārūn ar-Rashīd, where Amīr Banjī of the first family received a robe of honour, a standard and a patent of investiture with the rulership (*imārat*) of Ghūr, while his rival Shīth b. Bahrām was awarded the military command (*pahlavānī*) of the forces of Ghūr, "an arrangement which has continued like this till the present day".³³

From the religious point of view, these stories are clearly myths of a type familiar within the Islamic world. From the political one, the local origins of the Shansabānīs are quite obscure, but they cannot have elbowed aside other chieftains in Ghūr and consolidated their grip on the whole province until the second half of the 11th century at the earliest. A key to this story of the division of power may lie in events which Jūzjānī reports from Sultan Saif ad-Dīn Muḥammad's reign (556–8/1161–3). He relates how the Sultan treacherously murdered his commander-in-chief (*sepahsālār*), Warmesh b. Shīsh, but was in turn stabbed

³² Fakhr ad-Dīn Mubārakshāh and a *Muntakhab-i tārikh-i Nāsiri* written in Sultan Mu'izz ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. Sām's reign, in *Tab. Nās.*, 28–34, tr. I, pp. 300–10; Fakhr ad-Dīn and *Tab. Nās.* in Mīrkhwānd, IV, 42, 241; Fakhr ad-Dīn in Mu'īn ad-Dīn Zamchī, *Rauḍāt al-jannāt fī auṣāf Herāt*, India Office Persian Ms. 195, ff. 88b (quoting six verses of his metrical history of the Ghūrīds), 99a. On the name Shansab/Shanasb (<Gushnasp), see Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, p. 282. Marquart was the first to point out the fact that the Ghūrīds, despite the frequency of the name "Sām" in their genealogy, did not derive their origin from Rustam's family, but from that of the tyrant Zahāk, a repugnant figure in the tradition of the Iranian lands further to the west ("Das Reich Zābul", pp. 289–90). Cf. Huart ("Les légendes épiques de la région de Ghazna (Afghanistan)", *Comptes-rendus de l'Acad. des Inscr. et Belles-lettres*, 1916, pp. 579–87) and Minorsky ("Gardizi on India", *B.S.O.A.S.*, XII, 1948, p. 625) have further cited the popularity of Zahāk in the region of Ghazna and Zābulistān.

³³ *Tab. Nās.*, 34–8, tr. I, 311–16.

in the back on the battle-field by Warmesh's brother Abū'l-'Abbās b. Shīsh, who had succeeded to the office of *sepahsālār* and is called "Pahlavān-i Ghūr and from the Shīshānī family". It was probably a desire to explain these circumstances of the 12th century which led to the elaboration of the story about a division of offices in Hārūn's reign. The Shīshānīs were obviously a powerful family in the middle of the 12th century, powerful enough through their military following and prestige to challenge the Shansabānī kings' authority in Ghūr. We do not know how old the rivalry was, but the episode illustrates how tensions arose within Ghūr as the Shansabānīs asserted their primacy and how this primacy was still being challenged at this late date.³⁴ Finally, we may note a very popular legend which historians of the Afghans set forth. As Jūzjānī does not mention it, it probably grew up after his time, but it may be read in detail in Ni'mat Allāh's *Makhzan-i Afghānī* (written 1021/1613). According to this, Islam came to the Afghans who had settled in Ghūr after the dispersion of the Children of Israel, through the agency of Khālid b. al-Walīd. He wrote to their leader Qais announcing the appearance of the Seal of the Prophets, and Qais came with a band of fellow-chieftains to help Muḥammad at Medina. The Prophet gave him the Islamic name of 'Abd ar-Rashīd and sent him back to evangelise Ghūr.³⁵

Let us return to fact. After the expedition of 1010-11 Sultan Maḥmūd left teachers to instruct the people of Ghūr in the precepts of Islam.³⁶ He dethroned Muḥammad b. Sūrī of Āhengerān and installed his eldest son Abū 'Alī; during Muḥammad b. Sūrī's chieftainship, explains Jūzjānī, the son had sought closer relations with the Sultan, whereas the

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 65-6, tr. I, 366-7. The name Shīth or Shīsh also appears within the Shansabānī royal line (*ibid.*, 41, tr. I, 329). If it were possible to attach any significance to this alleged division of power, we would be reminded of the institution of double kingship found among certain Altaic peoples. Marquart did in fact suggest, on very slight evidence, that there was some such arrangement in the neighbouring kingdom of Zābulistān, whose ruler had the title of Zunbīl/Zūnbīl, before the Ṣaffārid conquest ("Das Reich Zābul", pp. 275-6). Although there were in eastern Afghanistan strong Turkish ethnic currents, such as the Khalaj and Oghuz nomads, relics perhaps of Ephthalite dominion there, Ghūr was at this time a purely Iranian land, and a division of power in a politically-unified Ghūr plays no part in Jūzjānī's narrative except in conjunction with Warmesh's murder. Maricq, *Le minaret de Djam*, pp. 61-3, has arrived at the same explanation as myself for this projection-back of the Shansabānī-Shīshānī rivalry; and he has also made the valuable identification of the Shīshānī family of chiefs with the *Warmesh-pat of Jurwas in Baih., 116-19, thus elucidating Minorsky, *H. al-'a.*, 333.

³⁵ *History of the Afghans*, tr. B. Dorn (London, 1829-36), I, pp. 37-9; II, pp. 74 ff.

³⁶ I.A., IX, 156.

father had stood firmly for the independence of Ghūr. Abū 'Alī reigned until some time during Sultan Mas'ūd's reign, when another member of the Shansabānī family set him aside. Jūzjānī praises Abū 'Alī as the Amīr who firmly planted Islamic institutions in Ghūr: "As soon as the Amīr Abū 'Alī became established in Ghūr, he conferred great benefits on the people and directed the erection of many buildings of public utility. He built Friday mosques and madrasas in the land of Ghūr and endowed them liberally with *auqāf*. He held the religious leaders and ulema in great respect, and considered it a duty of his rank to venerate hermits and ascetics. Thus the inhabitants of the regions of Ghūr dwelt in tranquillity."³⁷

During the next century, Ghūr became a buffer-state between the Seljuqs and the truncated Ghaznevid empire. Ghūr, together with Sistan, Herat and Pūshang, was allotted to Mūsā Yabghu b. Seljuq when, after the victory of Dendānqān in 1040, the Seljuq leaders partitioned the lands they had conquered.³⁸ Whether Mūsā Yabghu was in fact able to exercise any control over Ghūr and counter the influence from the east of the Ghaznevids is dubious. The 14th century historian Shabānkārā'i implies that it was Ghaznevid influence which continued to predominate, for he states that Ghūr fell away when Sultan 'Abd ar-Rashīd was assassinated by a usurper in 444/1053.³⁹ This control may have been restored by the capable and energetic Sultan Ibrāhīm b. Mas'ūd, but after his death in 492/1099, the Ghaznevids declined and the Ghūrids overthrew them some 70 years later.

We know nothing about the progress of Islam in Ghūr during the century or so after Amīr Abū 'Alī's death, but it cannot have met with any prolonged resistance; local paganism can have had small emotional appeal or intellectual content with which to oppose the new faith. Even so, the spread of Islam through this broken and isolated region must have taken a certain amount of time. I suggest that in this work of evangelism, the Muslim sect of the Karāmiyya played an unspectacular but important part.⁴⁰ This sect was Khurasanian in origin; its founder,

³⁷ *Tab. Nās.*, 41, tr. I, 329. Already by 1032 a Ghaznevid official had possessions in Ghūr (Baih., 326).

³⁸ 'Imād ad-Dīn in Bundārī, *Zubdat an-nuṣra*, ed. Houtsma (Leiden, 1889), p. 8; al-Ḥusainī, *Akhbār ad-daulat as-Saljūqiyya*, ed. M. Iqbal (Lahore, 1933), p. 17. Ghūr is not mentioned as part of Mūsā Yabghu's share in Rāwandī, *Rāhat aṣ-ṣudūr*, ed. Iqbal, *G.M.S.* (London, 1921), p. 104.

³⁹ *Majma' al-ansāb*, f. 188a.

⁴⁰ The remaining part of this study formed part of a paper read at the Tenth Congress of British Orientalists, Bangor, July 1959, as "The Karāmiyya and the conversion of Ghūr".

Muḥammad b. Karām (the correct spelling of this name seems to be without *tashdīd ar-rā'*), came from Sistan, but studied and taught for some time in Nishapur before his death in exile in 869. According to his orthodox opponents, he taught an extreme theological literalism and was guilty of anthropomorphism. After his death, the leaders of the sect appear frequently in Khurasanian political and social life as a violent and persecuting force against religious dissent; they gained the backing of many sections of the peasantry and the urban lower classes through their piety and ascetic lives. Moreover, they had some support and sympathy from Sebūktigin and Maḥmūd of Ghazna, and in the latter's reign they almost gained permanent control of Nishapur. This attempt was quashed, but the Karāmiyya remained an influential element in Khurasanian religious life down to the Mongol invasions. The Karāmiyya had an old tradition of evangelism in the lands on the upper Oxus; according to Shahrastānī, Muḥammad b. Karām's first activities after expulsion from his native Sistan had been amongst the peasants and illiterates of Gharchistān, Ghūr and the countryside of Khurasan.⁴¹ It is therefore possible that the sprinkling of Muslims in Ghūr mentioned by the geographers of the 10th century were the fruits of his preaching and that in subsequent times the Karāmiyya kept up some connections with Ghūr. In his concern for the pacification of Ghūr, Maḥmūd's relations with the Karāmiyya in Nishapur may have suggested to him that here was a safe outlet for their missionary zeal. There are many parallels outside the Islamic world where an enthusiastic but doubtfully orthodox sect has been deflected to work in remote, unevangelised areas: the work of the Monophysites in Nubia, Ethiopia and South Arabia, of the Paulicians in eastern Anatolia and the Balkans under the Byzantines, and, in more recent times, of the Old Believers beyond the Urals in Siberia, comes to mind.

I have not so far found any direct evidence on the course of this activity, but the connection of the sect with the early Ghaznevid Sultans and that dynasty's concern – if only on the grounds of political stability – for the conversion of Ghūr are significant. Furthermore, we do have two interesting accounts of how the Ghūrid kings finally renounced their adherence to the Karāmiyya in favour of the more orthodox Muslim law-schools. These are given by Ibn al-Athīr under the year 595/1199 and by Jūzjānī.⁴²

⁴¹ *Kirāb al-milal wa'n-nihāl*, ed. W. Cureton (London, 1846), p. 20, tr. T. Haarbrücker (Halle, 1850–1), I, pp. 29–30. On the origins and early history of the sect, see Bosworth, "The rise of the Karāmiyyah in Khurasan", *Muslim World*, L/1 (Jan. 1960), pp. 5–14.

⁴² *Tab. Nās.*, 77–80, tr. I, 384–5; I.A., XII, 101. The episode has been treated, in a

Jūzjānī states that Ghiyāth ad-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 599/1202–3) and his brother and successor Mu‘izz ad-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 602/1205–6) both inherited the Karāmī tenets which their dynasty had always held and which had always been the majority faith of their subjects. The two sources relate the story of the two rulers’ conversion in different ways, but agree that the main stimulus came from the Shāfi‘ī faqīh Shaikh Wajih ad-Dīn Abū’l-Faṭḥ Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd al-Marvar-rūdhi (Jūzjānī, 77, has Waḥīd ad-Dīn Muḥammad-i Marvazī, with the variant Marvarrūdhi). According to Ibn al-Athīr, Shaikh Wajih ad-Dīn came to the Ghūrid court in 1199 through the agency of the court poet Fakhr ad-Dīn Mubārakshāh, exposed the errors of the Karāmiyya and converted Ghiyāth ad-Dīn to his own rite. The Sultan then built madrasas in his dominions for the Shāfi‘īs and built a mosque for them at Ghazna (this may have been the first Shāfi‘ī one there since the destruction of Ghazna by ‘Alā’ ad-Dīn Jehān-Sūz). Then Ibn al-Athīr gives another explanation, that the two brothers were converted through the pressure of social and religious circumstances when they conquered Khurasan.⁴³ “They were told then that ‘all the people of this land [sc. Khurasan] condemn and despise the Karāmiyya. It would be advisable for you to give up their doctrines’. So they both became Shāfi‘īs.” From his Mesopotamian homeland, Ibn al-Athīr had difficulty in harmonising accounts of events in the far east of the Islamic world, and he adds yet another report, that Mu‘izz ad-Dīn became not a Shāfi‘ī but a Ḥanafī; this is confirmed by the story in Jūzjānī that he became a Ḥanafī when he began to rule in Ghazna (sc. in 569/1173–4) and saw that all the people of Ghazna and the surrounding territory were Ḥanafīs. It therefore seems that the brothers’ abandonment of Karāmī doctrines was connected with the extension of their power into the Khurasan and Ghazna regions. They burst out of the confines of Ghūr, where the Karāmī divines had had paramount authority in religion, into the wider world. They came into contact here with the two chief law-schools of Sunnī Islam in the east, and they may have felt that the Karāmī tenets were intellectually

briefier manner than here, by Köprülüzade M. Fuat, “XIİnci asırda bir Türk filoloğu: Fahreddin Mübarekşah ve eseri”, *Türk dili ve edebiyatı hakkında araştırmalar*, (Istanbul, 1934), pp. 132–4, and by Maricq, *Le minaret de Djām*, pp. 49–50.

⁴³ The Ghūrids occupied Herat in 571/1175, and shortly afterwards their suzerainty was recognised in Kerman. Ghiyāth ad-Dīn began the conquest of Khurasan as soon as the Khwārizmshāh Tekesh died, and occupied Nishapur in 596/1200 and Merv and Serakhs the next year (*Tab. Nās.*, 73–5, tr. I, pp. 377–8, 380–1; cf. M. Longworth Dames, *E.I.*¹, Art. “*Ghōrids*”, and Wiet, *Le minaret de Djām*, pp. 38–43).

somewhat disreputable and too closely linked with their backwoods origins.

Jūzjānī's account of Ghiyāth ad-Dīn's conversion is adorned with a more miraculous element: Shaikh Wajīh ad-Dīn is involved, but the immediate cause is the Sultan's vision in a dream of the Imām ash-Shāfi'ī. The change, he goes on to relate, angered the numerous ulema of the Karāmiyya. One of them, the Imām Ṣadr ad-Dīn 'Alī b. Haiṣam Nishāpūrī, who was *mudarris* of the Karāmī madrasa at Afshīn or Bashīn in Gharchistān, censured the Sultan in some verses, and as a result, had to withdraw to Nishapur for a year before he recovered favour. This Imām's Nishāpūrī origin, and the fact that he chose that city for his temporary exile, show that the Karāmiyya were still important and still producing their own divines there, despite the report in Ibn al-Athīr about the low prestige of the Karāmiyya in Khurasan.⁴⁴

But if the Karāmī doctrines could not in Khurasan retain an intellectual repute comparable to that of the Ḥanafī or Shāfi'ī rites, in Ghūr itself their hold on both the populace at large and on other members of the Ghūrīd dynasty was little diminished. Again under 595/1199, Ibn al-Athīr records a great *fitna* at Ghiyāth ad-Dīn's military headquarters and capital at Fīrūzkūh in Ghūr.⁴⁵ Its cause was the Sultan's favour towards the Shāfi'ī faqīh and philosopher Fakhr ad-Dīn Rāzī (543–606/1148–1209), who had been attracted to the court by Ghiyāth ad-Dīn's well-known munificence towards scholars and literary men. According to 'Aufī, Rāzī gained there the title *Malik al-kalām*.⁴⁶ The Sultan built for him a madrasa in Herat where Rāzī's teaching attracted many hearers, but drew down on his head the wrath of the Karāmiyya, who were very numerous there, and of the Ghūrīs in general, headed by the Sultan's cousin and son-in-law, Malik Ḍiyā' ad-Dīn Muḥammad (ruled in Ghūr and Zamīndāwar 599–603/1203–7 and 611–12/1214–15 with the title 'Alā' ad-Dīn). Rāzī was well-known as a bitter opponent of the

⁴⁴ Mīrkhwānd, IV, p. 244, merely records that Ghiyāth ad-Dīn became a Shāfi'ī because of the Shāfi'īs' purity of life and emphasis on traditions from the Prophet.

⁴⁵ On Fīrūzkūh, cf. *Ṭab. Nās.*, 91, tr. I, pp. 403–4; Kohzad, *Afghanistan*, VII/1 (1952), pp. 51–3. Dames, *E.I.*¹, Art. "Fīrūzkōh" followed Holdich in identifying it with Taiwāra on the Rud-i Ghor in the southern part of the province. Maricq has now shown that the 200 ft. tall Minaret of Jam standing on the right bank of the Heri Rud between Chisht and Āhengerān marks the site of the Ghūrīds' fortress-capital. The neglect until now of this minaret by European travellers has arisen from the fact that in recent times the route through the Heri Rud basin has made a detour out of the river-valley and along an affluent, and has thus by-passed the site (*Le minaret de Djam*, pp. 13–20, 55–64).

⁴⁶ 'Aufī, *Lubāb al-albāb*, quoted by Köprülüzade, *op. cit.*, pp. 130–1.

Karāmiyya. Ibn al-Qiftī says that they threatened to have his life in revenge for his attacks on them and that it was said to be they who finally poisoned him; certainly, Rāzī left instructions that he was to be buried in his house rather than publicly, lest the Herat mob mutilate his corpse.⁴⁷

Rāzī and the ulema of the Karāmiyya, Ḥanafīs and Shāfi'īs gathered at the Fīrūzkūh court. In a theological disputation, Rāzī attacked a Karāmī divine well-known for his piety and learning, the Qāḍī Majd ad-Dīn, known as Ibn al-Qudwa.⁴⁸ In reply, Malik Ḍiyā' ad-Dīn Muḥammad accused Rāzī of *zandaqa* and *falsafa*, and Ibn al-Qudwa denounced him from the pulpit, attacking at the same time the teachings of Aristotle, the infidelities of Ibn Sīnā and the philosophy of al-Fārābī. The population was so roused that they rose and bloodshed was only averted by the arrival of troops from the Sultan's palace. Ghiyāth ad-Dīn had to promise to remove Rāzī from their midst and send him back to Herat.⁴⁹ The episode probably dates from just after the Sultan's conversion to the Shāfi'ī *madhhab*, when he wished to encourage the great philosopher but was apprehensive lest he alienate the popular support of the Ghūrī people, upon whom the military strength of the dynasty largely depended.

In this survey of the religious history of Ghūr at this period, we may finally note that the Karāmiyya were strongly opposed to the Bāṭiniyya; it was their fervour in rooting out Ismā'īlī sympathisers in Nishapur at the beginning of the 11th century which so commended them to Sultan Maḥmūd.⁵⁰ Now Ismā'īlī *dā'īs* from Alamūt penetrated into Ghūr in the latter years of the Sultan 'Alā' ad-Dīn Ḥusain Jehān-Sūz's reign (544–56/1149–61), were sympathetically received by him and started to work in the countryside. But his son Saif ad-Dīn Muḥammad (556–8/1161–3) ordered on his accession a massacre of all Ismā'īlī adherents in Ghūr: "Wherever he smelt the odour of their seductions, throughout all

⁴⁷ *Ta'rikh al-hukamā'*, ed. J. Lippert (Leipzig, 1903), pp. 291–2; Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt ash-Shāfi'iyyat al-kubrā* (Cairo, 1323–4), V, p. 35; cf. Ibn Khallikān, tr. de Slane, II, p. 653.

⁴⁸ He is described as an adherent of the Haiṣamiyya branch of the Karāmiyya. Muḥammad b. al-Haiṣam is mentioned by Ibn Ḥajar in his *Lisān al-mizān* (Hyderabad, 1329–31), V, pp. 353–6, and Shahrastānī, *Kitāb al-milal wa'n-niḥal*, pp. 80 ff., tr. I, pp. 120 ff., as a leader of the sect after Muḥammad b. Karām's death and as their *mutakallim*, elaborating their founder's doctrine of *tajsim*. Fakhr ad-Dīn Rāzī himself in his *I'tiqādāt firaq al-muslimin wa'l-mushrikīn* (Cairo, 1356), p. 67, describes the Haiṣamiyya as one of the seven branches of the Karāmiyya.

⁴⁹ I.A., s.v. 595/1199.

⁵⁰ See Bosworth, "The rise of the Karamiyyah in Khurasan", pp. 10–11.

the land he ordered the slaughter of the heretics. He despatched the whole of them to Hell, and thus by means of the sword purified the territories of Ghūr, which were a mine of righteousness and orthodoxy, from the pollution of the Qarmathian evil."⁵¹ It is in persecuting activity such as this that one would expect to find the Karāmī leaders prominent.

The silence of later sources shows that in the chaos caused by the Mongol invasions the Karāmiyya gradually lost their separate identity in Ghūr and the surrounding regions. The historian of Herat, Muʿīn ad-Dīn Zamchī, writing in 1492, characterised the people of Ghūr as notoriously stupid but impeccably pure in their faith and hatred of innovation.⁵² As in Nishapur two centuries previously, the sect's appeal to the unsophisticated mountain folk of Ghūr lay primarily in the godly lives of its imāms and the straightforward literalism of its teachings; yet if, as I have suggested, it brought Islam to this remote corner, its achievement was a not unworthy one.⁵³

⁵¹ *Tab. Nās.*, pp. 63, 65, tr. I, pp. 363, 365. The references in the *Siyāset-nāme* of Niẓām al-mulk, ed. Qazwīnī and Chahārdehī (Tehran, 1334), pp. 218, 230–1, to the activities of Ismāʿīlī *dāʿīs* in Ghūr at the beginning of the 10th century are too vague to be relied upon.

⁵² *Rauḍāt al-jannāt fī auṣāf Herāt*, f. 88b.

⁵³ In an excursus, "Die Lage der Ariaspēn", pp. 166–72 of his *Wehrot und Arang, Untersuchungen zur mythischen und geschichtlichen Landeskunde von Ostiran* (ed. H. H. Schaeder, Leiden, 1938), Markwart examined the information given in classical Greek sources on the geography of the Heri Rud basin above Herat. He concluded that in the last period of the Achaemenids, the population of Ghūr was largely sedentary, and that it recognised the authority of the Persian emperor or his viceroys only nominally. On p. 171 n. 1 Markwart mentioned briefly Islamic sources concerning Arab and Ghaznevid raids on Ghūr.

YAKUB BEG (1820-1877) AND THE MOSLEM REBELLION IN CHINESE TURKESTAN

by

TSING YUAN

Washington

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is two-fold: first, to focus attention on a portion of history of an almost ignored and neglected region; secondly, to show the international implications of a new Moslem state in Central Asia in and age of European expansion.

The general obscurity that surrounds Chinese Turkestan is historically unjustified. For centuries the only route from China to Europe known as the Silk Road ran through this area. This route witnessed the migration of Buddhism from India to China and the shipment of luxury goods from China to Rome. It has been the meeting ground of Hellenic, Iranian, Indian, and Chinese civilizations. Indeed, according to one authority, the center of the civilized world as late as 1500 was located at Ferghana,¹ only three hundred miles west of Kashgar, the focal point of a new Moslem state under Yakub Beg.

Being strategically located, the region's international significance ever since the middle of the nineteenth century was obvious. To Russia, it could become a thorn among her newly acquired Moslem subjects. To England, it could become a stepping-stone for possible Russian invasion of India. To the Chinese Empire, the northwest frontier would lie defenseless without this buffer. To the Ottoman Empire, Yakub Beg's state had prestige value since it was a symbol of Moslem unity. But during the period of Yakub Beg's rule (1866-77) the international conflict was essentially a duel between England and Russia for power and influence within the new state. Indeed, their actions represented an effort on the part of the European powers to fill political vacuums in Asia.

In one sense, the story of Yakub Beg's rise to power evokes even a current interest. Amidst reports of wide-spread unrest among the Uighur

¹ Arnold Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial* (New York, 1958), p. 69.

population against Chinese communist rule, it is not inconceivable that these Moslems cherish the memory of Yakub Beg, who came to be regarded as a hero in the creation of an independent state. Moreover, Russia continues to take an active interest in this region, particularly in view of recent discoveries of uranium. On the other hand, India has assumed the British role of guarding her frontier in this area as shown by her present resistance to China's westward expansion.

THE BACKGROUND

Geographical Sketch

Chinese Turkestan, situated between 75 and 95 degrees longitude and between 36 and 50 degrees latitude, occupies an area of roughly 600,000 square miles, or more than twice the size of Texas. However, more than one half of it is uninhabitable, being covered by deserts, the most notable of which is the Takla Makan, which stretches from east to west for about 700 miles. The mountainous chain or the Tian Shan cuts the entire region into two parts: Dzungaria and Kuldja in the north and Kashgaria in the south. It was in Kashgaria that Yakub Beg established his power, and it was from his capital, Kashgar, that the name of the whole southern portion of Chinese Turkestan is derived. This same portion is also sometimes spoken of as Yarkand, from the name of another city to the southeast which was even more populous than Kashgar.² Still another name is Alty Shahr, or Six Cities, which make up this region, namely: Kashgar, Yangy Hissar, Yarkand, Khotan, Ush Turfan, and Aksu. For our purposes, we shall use the term Kashgaria to designate the southern portion of Chinese Turkestan, whereas the northeastern and northwestern portions are respectively known as Dzungaria and Kuldja (or Ili in Chinese). Also, we shall use the terms Chinese Turkestan and Eastern Turkestan interchangeably for the same area, because for a period of history, the region was not under Chinese control, and when it was finally ruled from Peking, the officials appointed to govern it were Manchus and not Chinese. However, the modern term Sinkiang to designate Chinese Turkestan did not come into use until 1882, well after the time of Yakub Beg.

² Demetrius C. Boulger, *The Life of Yakoob Beg* (London, 1878), p. 3.

Population

The population of Chinese Turkestan before the advent of Yakub Beg was mixed. The majority were Uighurs, who belonged to the Turkish family and formed the chief inhabitants of Kashgaria. The Taranchis or "cultivators" were essentially Uighurs, who had been brought by the Manchus in 1762 from Kashgaria to the Kuldja region, where they prospered and formed a majority. There were also the Kazakhs and the Kirghiz, who led a nomadic existence in the north and west toward the Russian border. The Kalmucks or Western Mongols could be found in Dzungaria and also in Kuldja. Furthermore, there were the Tunganis, whose origin is disputed by scholars; one theory being that they were Chinese but were converted to Islam, the other theory is that they were the descendents of Uighurs who had intermarried with the Chinese. Nevertheless, as a group, the Tunganis had their settlements in the eastern portion of Chinese Turkestan as well as in the provinces of Kansu and Shensi. As to the non-Moslem Chinese, they were nowhere a majority and lived for the most part in the cities where they were either merchants or soldiers of the garrison. In Kashgaria there were also the Kokandian merchants or Andijanis who formed important colonies in the cities. In the same area were Afghans and Badakshis. The complexity of the population can well be imagined.

Historical Sketch of Chinese Influence

Before the Manchu dynasty (1644-1911), Chinese political influence in Eastern Turkestan was felt only intermittently, chiefly in the Han (202 B.C.-220 A.D.) and the T'ang (618-907) periods. In the Han period, an active policy was adopted to isolate the Huns or Hsiung Nu from the petty states in the area. This policy succeeded in removing their threat to China either in the form of their submission, or in that of their migration westward. By 102 B.C., Chinese suzerainty had been imposed on most of the kingdoms of Eastern Turkestan.³ With the decline and collapse of the Han dynasty, Chinese political influence ceased to exist, and it was not until 650 that it was re-asserted. The Chinese supremacy, however, lasted only about 100 years, for with the defeat of the Chinese by the Arabs at Talas in 751, Eastern Turkestan was again lost to China. This event was followed by a series of migrations of the Uighurs and the

³ *Encyclopedia of World History*, comp. & ed. by William L. Langer (Boston, 1948), p. 133.

Kirghiz into this area. Islam began its process of conversion in the 10th century, but Buddhism and Nestorian Christianity were not entirely replaced until well into the 16th century.⁴

It was not until the Manchu dynasty that the Chinese really achieved a political foothold in Eastern Turkestan. Two factors seemed to have contributed to bring about this conquest. First, the emergence of the power of the Kalmucks or Ölots (or Eleuths) in Kuldja and Dzungaria, when confronted by the military expansionism of the Manchus, made conflict inevitable. Secondly, the state of weakness in Kashgaria, created by the power struggle between two rival factions of the ruling Khoja family, invited Manchu intervention.

The Kalmucks were a confederation of Western Mongols that rose to power in the early part of the 17th century. Their power soon extended from the western confines of Mongolia across Dzungaria to the Issyk-kul basin. Under Galdan (1644-97), the Kalmucks conquered all of Eastern Turkestan.⁵ Although Galdan was eventually defeated by the Manchus near Urga in 1696, the power of the Kalmucks was not broken. For about half of a century, the Manchus hesitated to invade Dzungaria. A leader of the Kalmucks named Amursana was instrumental for the Manchu conquest. For Amursana (d. 1757) in 1755 invited them to eliminate his rival Kalmuck chieftain. Once victorious, he sought to rebel against the Manchus, but was disastrously defeated. As a result, the whole of Dzungaria and Kuldja passed under Manchu rule, with Kashgaria the next Manchu objective.

From the 17th century onward, Kashgaria was ruled by a remarkable family: the Khojas, who claimed descent from Mohammed himself.⁶ The Kashgaris cherished in particular the memory of a member of this house, Hadayatulla by name, whose "peculiar sanctity gave him complete ascendancy throughout the country"⁷ toward the close of the 17th century. His successors, however, were not made of his caliber. In the time of Galdan, the Khojas were essentially the vassals of the Kalmucks. Nevertheless, fratricidal struggle between two Khoja factions persisted. In 1758, the mistreatment of Manchu officers by the Khoja follower of Amursana furnished the pretext for Manchu occupation of Kashgaria. By the end of 1759, the Manchu conquest of the entire Eastern Turkestan was complete.

⁴ James Hutton, *Central Asia: from the Aryan to the Cossack* (London, 1875), p. 371.

⁵ *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period*, ed. by Arthur W. Hummel (Washington, D.C., 1944), p. 266.

⁶ Boulger, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

Manchu Administration Before the Advent of Yakub Beg

The government of the whole of Chinese Turkestan was in the hands of a Manchu Viceroy at Kuldja. He had under him two lieutenant-governors or Ambans, one for each of the regions north and south of Tien Shan. The Amban of Kashgaria, residing in Yarkand, was in charge of all the internal affairs of his region, but it was stipulated that external affairs were to be referred to the Viceroy, who communicated directly with Peking.⁸ Under the Amban was a deputy or Kichik Amban, who had four aides: the military or Yang Tay Dalay, the civil or Yang Pang Dalay, the financial or Sang Dalay, and the judicial or Khoboy Dalay.⁹ These Dalays or "chiefs" had deputies who, with their subordinates, performed most of the functions of government.

The elaborate Manchu bureaucracy was to an extent superfluous; for notwithstanding alien rule, the Moslem inhabitants of Chinese Turkestan were actually governed by their own officials. Their head, the Hakim Beg or Wang had entire jurisdiction over the Moslems in such functions as the administration of justice and the collection of taxes. The Hakim Beg was outranked only by the Amban. To insure his fidelity to the Manchu cause the Hakim Beg was given, in addition to his salary, landed estates which were considerable both in extent and in value.¹⁰ Occasionally, the Hakim Begs were removed on account of corruption or incompetence, but the Ambans were not above accepting bribes from the Hakim Begs for their appointments.

It would be too much to credit the Manchu administration as one of sweetness and light, yet before 1820 it was on the whole benevolent and efficient. Taxation was not onerous. Trade was flourishing. Order and security were well preserved in the territory.

YAKUB BEG'S RISE TO POWER

Underlying Causes

Although Yakub Beg did not enter the Kashgarian scene until 1865, the factors that brought about his rise to power were inherent in the political situation of Chinese Turkestan after 1820. Thereafter, for a period of

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

⁹ T. D. Forsyth, *Report of a Mission to Yarkund in 1873* (Calcutta, 1875), p. 96.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

forty years, Kashgaria was torn by a series of rebellions that exacerbated the religious differences between the Manchus and their Moslem subjects. The following causes may be taken as preparing the way for Yakub Beg's success.

First of all, a wave of Islamic resurgence was sweeping through the Moslem population of Chinese Turkestan. Whether this religious movement was an outcome of Wahabi inspiration seemed improbable, but it did assume a form of Islamic militancy that fed on the religious differences between the Moslems and the Manchus. The leaders of the militant Moslems were the Andijanians of Khokandian merchants, who resided in Kashgaria. In order to dissuade the Khan of Khokand from giving encouragement to possible rebellions in Chinese Turkestan, the Manchus had in 1832 granted him certain privileges. These included the collection of dues from the Andijanians in Chinese Turkestan by their headmen or *Aksakals* direct to the Khan. Also, a Khokandian inspector was appointed to reside at Kashgar to supervise these *Aksakals*, who were to have complete control over all the foreign Moslems in Kashgaria.¹¹ Needless to say, this existence of a state within a state provided for the Andijanians a good deal of immunity in their subversive activities. Their hostility to Manchu rule was not motivated by religious considerations alone, for on the economic plane they had keen competition with Chinese merchants. Still, the Andijanians were the personifications of Islamic militancy, and they stood ready to support any Moslem rebellion against Manchu rule.

The second cause of Yakub Beg's rise to power can be directly traced to the increasing inefficiency after 1820 of the Manchu administration in Chinese Turkestan. Perhaps one reason for this inefficiency was the prevailing custom that only Manchu bannerman could be appointed officials.¹² Whereas competent Chinese officials could be appointed to compensate for any dearth of Manchu talent in China Proper, this custom did not prevail in Chinese Turkestan. Moreover, the Taiping Rebellion (1850-64) and the Nien Rebellion (1853-68), taxing as they did the entire attention of the Manchu government in China, contributed indirectly to Manchu weakness in Chinese Turkestan. There, taxation had to be increased to meet deficiencies in the depleted imperial treasury, and veteran troops were called away to China Proper to help fight the Taiping rebels.

¹¹ Forsyth, *op. cit.*, p. 185.

¹² Wen-djang Chu, *The Policy of the Manchu Government in the Suppression of the Moslem Rebellion in Shensi, Kansu, and Sinkiang From 1862 to 1878*. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis for the University of Washington, 1955, p. 7.

Not least important in revealing the bankruptcy of Manchu power were the repeated reverses suffered at the hands of European aggression. From the time of the Opium War (1839-42) and the Anglo-French seizure of Canton in 1858, to the final occupation of Peking by British and French troops in 1860, the Manchus forfeited all the respect due to them as rulers of an empire. Torn from within and threatened from without, the Manchus had their hands full when a rebellion took place in Chinese Turkestan in 1864.

It was the growing power of Russia that in the third place convinced the Moslem population of Chinese Turkestan of the fatal decline of the Manchus. This reason for Yakub Beg's rise to power can be traced to the concessions that the Manchus granted to Russia and also to Russia's acquisitions of vast territories in Central Asia. By the Treaty of Kuldja in 1851, Russia gained her first economic foothold in Chinese Turkestan. This treaty provided for Russian commercial dealings with Kuldja (Ili) and Chuguchak (Tacheng) and permitted Russian consuls to be stationed in these cities. In 1860, by the Treaty of Peking, Kashgar was also opened to Russian trade. The Russians were guaranteed barter trade free of customs duty. Again, by the Treaty of Tarbagatsi of 1864, also known as the Protocol of Chuguchak, China yielded frontier territories to the west of Uliassutai and also on the eastern bank of the Zaisan Nor as far as the River Ayagus.

The establishment by Russia in Central Asia of Fort Vernoe (1853) and Forts Tokmak and Piskak (1860) contributed greatly to the Manchus' loss of prestige.¹³ The net result of Russian gains convinced the Moslems of Chinese Turkestan that the Manchus could not be counted upon to protect them from the ever-advancing Russian arms in Central Asia. A new focus of loyalty was therefore opened to the advantage of Yakub Beg.

Fourthly, there were precedents to the rebellion that brought Yakub Beg to power. In four rebellions, all dating after 1820, the Khoja family, expelled by the Manchus in 1760, furnished the leaders: Jahangir in 1825, Yusuf in 1830, seven Khoja brothers in 1846, and Wali Khan in 1857. Except for Jahangir, their tenure in Kashgaria lasted on an average of three months; Jahangir was able to rule for nine months before the Manchus could send troops to crush him.¹⁴ With unchanging uniformity, these Khojas led their band of followers from their base in Khokand, drove the Manchu troops from Kashgaria, settled down to a life of

¹³ Forsyth, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 184-8.

indulgence, but finally were defeated by Manchu reinforcements from Kuldja. The rise and suppression of these rebellions resulted in frightful massacres on both sides. The increased taxation and religious differences together with the massacres accentuated the estrangement already existing between the rulers and the ruled. In 1865 another Khoja from Khokand, named Buzurg Khan, appeared before the walls of Kashgar. His general was no other than the famous Yakub Beg.

The immediate occasion of this rebellion, however, was a Moslem uprising of the Tungani in the province of Kansu. It seems to have arisen owing to the economic exploitation of Moslem peasantry by Manchu officials, sparked by a series of incidents in one of which a Moslem village was set on fire.¹⁵ In Salar or Hochow, Kansu, an important center for Tungani sectarians, a minor insurrection broke out in early 1862 – one which rapidly assumed major proportions. By the end of the year, the rebellion had spread eastward to Shensi and westward to Dzungaria and eastern Kashgaria. Both Hami and Aksu fell into rebel hands.¹⁶ The rebellion in Chinese Turkestan was facilitated by the fact that the Tungani formed a considerable portion of the garrisons posted near the cities. As soon as the news of a Tungani uprising arrived from Kansu, these Tungani troops mutinied against their Manchu officials and massacred the remaining non-Moslem Chinese troops and merchants. Though it was extensive, the Tungani rebellion was in no place well organized, and the lack of any coordinating leadership gave rise to a coterie of petty states, centered around the cities of Hami, Urumchi, and Manass (Suilai). But the damage was done. Owing to the fact that the main routes of communication to China were under Tungani control, the fate of Chinese garrisons in all of Chinese Turkestan was sealed. It was only a question of time before they would be eliminated.

After the Tungani uprising, a state of confusion existed in Kashgaria. The Uighur Moslems, encouraged and aided by the Andijanais, were not to be outdone by their co-religionists further to the east. Yarkand, the largest city in Kashgaria, led the revolt in August, 1863.¹⁷ Within six weeks, the cities of Khotan, Yangi Hissar, Kashgar, and Aksu all successfully threw off the Manchu control. Only a few forts still held out, and in these the Manchu troops waited only for slow starvation. After a siege of six months, the fort near Yarkand was stormed, and the Manchu Amban with his family and principal officers bombed themselves to bits

¹⁵ Chu, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

¹⁶ Forsyth, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 203.

rather than face inevitable massacre.¹⁸ Similar occurrences took place in other forts until only the fort outside Kashgar Yangyshahr, by far the strongest and best supplied, still held out. Meanwhile, dissension broke out among the Moslem victors themselves. One faction invited a Kirghiz chief, Sadic Beg, but finding him interested only in plunder, closed the city of Kashgar from his troops. This chief immediately put Kashgar under siege. After an unsuccessful siege of three months, he informed Khokand that a Khoja prince was needed to take charge of Kashgar. By playing on the sympathy of the people of Kashgar for a Khoja, he hoped to rule the city himself, using the Khoja as a puppet. This Khoja prince turned out to be incompetent, but his general, Yakub Beg, proved to be a formidable foe.

The Early Career of Yakub Beg

Yakub Beg (1820–1877) was born a subject of Khokand at Piskat near Tashkand. His later claim as having descended from Tamerlane seems to be unfounded.¹⁹ Nevertheless, both his father and grandfather were *kazis* or judges, and occupied respectable positions in important communities. His father, Pur Mohammed, married his mother as a second wife when he was the *kazi* of Karamma. Yakub Beg intended to become a mullah, but terminated his religious education to seek fortune in the capital, Khokand.

In 1847, through the influence of his brother-in-law, Musulman Kuli, Yakub Beg was appointed commander of a strategic fort on the Syr Darya, Ak Musjid. He seemed to have conducted himself with credit until 1853, when the Russian army operating from Kazalinsk resolved to take Ak Musjid.²⁰ Owing to his gallant defense, Yakub Beg withstood the Russian siege for 26 days. But after the Russians captured the fort, it was not precisely clear what happened to him, but eventually he appeared again on the Khokand scene.

The next stage of Yakub Beg's career saw his involvement in the politics of Khokand. The Khan at the time was Khudayar whose position was disputed by rivals, supported by a strong man named Alim Kuli. Yakub Beg's support shifted according to circumstances; he first

¹⁸ Boulger, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

²⁰ The question as to who was head of the Russian army seemed to be a matter of dispute. In Boulger's *Life of Yakooob Beg*, it was Gen. Perovsky (p. 81). But in M. A. Terentyef's *Russia and England in Central Asia*, trans. by F. C. Daukes (Calcutta, 1876) it is stated as Col. Blaremborg (p. 257, v. 1).

aided Khudayar's rival, then Khudayar, and when Alim Kuli put forth another candidate, he once again turned against Khudayar.²¹ In most of these maneuvers, he displayed considerable opportunism. The atmosphere of intrigue in Khokand certainly fostered his self-reliance and ruthlessness, characteristics which were later to distinguish him. In 1863, Yakub Beg's calculation proved correct, for Alim Kuli's champion was installed as Khan of Khokand and he was awarded command of the city of Tashkend for his services to Alim Kuli. But in October, 1864, in a battle with the Russians outside of the city, Yakub Beg was defeated.²² Although the Russians soon withdrew, he had lost considerable prestige. Besides, Alim Kuli had become suspicious of him as a potential rival. Thus, when reports arrived from the Kirghiz chief, Sadic Beg, requesting that a Khoja prince rule Kashgar, Alim Kuli immediately sent Buzurg Khan, the only remaining son of Jahangir who had invaded Kashgaria as long ago as 1825. Yakub Beg was selected by Alim Beg to accompany Buzurg Khan, the former considering the shift a good riddance. To Yakub Beg, the expedition meant a new field of adventure, where his own initiative would not be restrained by the stifling influence of Alim Kuli.

Growth of Yakub Beg's Power in Kashgaria

Since Alim Kuli could not spare any of his troops to Buzurg Khan, Yakub Beg had to raise what forces he could on his way to Kashgar. Only six persons formed this group when they left Tashkend, increasing to sixty-eight when they left Khokand.²³ It was with this small band that Buzurg Khan and his general entered Eastern Turkestan in the first days of 1865. Despite their small number, the inhabitants of Kashgar opened the gates to welcome them. But Buzurg Khan did not remain there long, for he soon retired to Yangy Hissar to lead a life of pleasure and indulgence. Meanwhile, Yakub Beg raised a small force among the Andijanians and Uighurs.

The confusing situation in early 1865 required that Yakub Beg accomplish at least four tasks: first, to bring the foreign Moslems and the Kirghiz to his side; secondly, to reduce the Manchu garrison of Yangy-shahr; thirdly, to clarify his relation with his chief, Buzurg Khan; and fourthly, to consolidate his control over Kashgaria. If one takes into

²¹ Forsyth, *op. cit.*, p. 195-7.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 197.

²³ Boulger, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

account his relative success with the meager resources at his disposal, his achievement was truly remarkable.

The first task of winning to his side the foreign Moslems and the Kirghiz was accomplished by a combination of diplomacy and force. Being a Khokandian himself, Yakub Beg had little difficulty in gaining the allegiance of the Andijanis, some of whom he appointed to responsible positions as city officials. But when bands of Afghan and Badakshi adventurers appeared in Kashgaria, seeking spoils of war in the midst of unrest, the problem became much more difficult. These adventurers were sturdy, warlike men, capable of great perseverance and courage. To crush them would exact too much from the slender resources of Yakub Beg. He therefore promised them profitable employment should they join him. Only thus did he win these warriors to his cause. On the other hand, the Kirghiz chief, Sadic Beg, seeing his dream of controlling Kashgaria through a Khoja puppet evaporate, revolted. Yakub Beg, after having defeated him, promised amnesty if Sadic Beg would serve under his command. With the incorporation of three thousand Kirghiz troops, Yakub Beg's army was vastly improved in numbers.²⁴ But the Kirghiz were to remain an unreliable element.

Nevertheless, these new reinforcements helped to facilitate the accomplishment of the second task, namely the storming of Yangyshahr which still contained an estimated six thousand Manchu troops.²⁵ But in this situation, treason was at work within the walls of the citadel. By September, 1865, a Manchu officer, Kho Dalay, had arranged terms with Yakub Beg for the surrender of the three thousand troops immediately under his command. When the Moslem army entered the citadel the governor committed suicide, and the other 3,000 soldiers not involved in the terms of surrender died in defense of the fort. After this bloody event Kho Dalay and his followers became known as "Yangy Musulmen", or "New Moslems", because to save their lives, they had embraced Islam. Thus, with the fall of Yangyshahr, all vestiges of Manchu authority disappeared from Kashgaria.

During this time the relation between Yakub Beg and his chief underwent considerable strain. Officially, Yakub Beg was the vizier of Buzurg Khan. But since that effeminate prince took not the slightest interest in public affairs, the conduct of the entire administration fell to Yakub Beg. Once, having been urged to engage in a battle, Buzurg Khan fled from the field before the initial setback was reversed by Yakub Beg. Angered

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

by his own shame and jealous of Yakub Beg's rising popularity, Buzurg Khan began to plot his general's downfall. He first sought the aid of the Sheik-ul-Islam to pronounce excommunication on Yakub Beg. Being a friend of the general, the religious leader refused to give his sanction.²⁶ But in November, 1865, after Yakub Beg narrowly escaped a conspiracy in Yarkand, Buzurg Khan led a large body of Kirghiz troops against his small band of 300 men.²⁷ Despite his numerical inferiority Yakub Beg won the day. Subsequently, he sent Buzurg Khan to Yangy Hissar where he kept him a prisoner for eighteen months.²⁸ Evidently, the power of the Khoja name made Yakub Beg hesitate on an irretrievable move. In 1867, however, feeling his power secure, he deported Buzurg Khan to Tibet from where he was to take a pilgrimage to Mecca. Buzurg Khan eventually returned to Khokand in 1869 and there died, the last hope of the Khoja family. Thus Yakub Beg became the undisputed leader in name as well as in actual power.

The consolidation of his power in Kashgaria, however, was the most demanding of Yakub Beg's tasks. Two phases can be distinguished in this consolidation: first, the subjection of the western and southern cities of Kashgaria; secondly, the wars with the Tungani states to the eastern fringe of the Takla Makan. During this first phase of subjecting local Uighurs and small Tungani bands, Yakub Beg freely resorted to unscrupulous ruthlessness. For example, after he was welcomed into Khotan, he invited the local chiefs to a feast. When he gave the signal, his guests were seized and immediately executed.²⁹ The excuse for this bloody treachery was founded on the faintest suspicions. Nevertheless, with the capture of Khotan early in 1867, and with Karalbashi or Bartchuk in his hands since 1865, all the cities of western Kashgaria were under his direct rule. In fact his sway also extended to the mountains of the Karakoram and the Kun Lun. With his southern and western flanks secured, he now turned his whole attention eastward to the Tungani possessions.

Being now in possession of Maralbashi, Yakub Beg could easily defend his eastern frontier against any possible invasions from the Tunganis; thus this second phase of his consolidation along the northern fringe of the Takla Makan was an aggression that was strategically unnecessary. The motives of his conflict with the Tunganis were, however, religious

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

²⁷ Forsyth, *op. cit.*, p. 211.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

²⁹ Boulger, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

and financial. Although the Tunganis were Moslems, they belonged to the Shafite sect, which, to the orthodox Sunni Uighurs and Andjanis, perverted the doctrine of Islam.³⁰ Besides, since Yakub Beg had promised his Afghan and Badakshi troops lucrative employment, the Tungani territory furnished the necessary field of plunder. Yet, if we are to evaluate these two motives, the religious one probably predominated. For the Tungani territory had already lost much of its wealth through constant inter-Tungani strife. Indeed, his troops were considerably disappointed at the meager spoils they obtained from these bloody wars. Moreover, in weakening his Tungani neighbours, Yakub Beg did himself incalculable harm. For had they not been thus weakened, the Tunganis might later have offered a much tougher resistance to the Chinese army and consequently might have prolonged the independence of Kashgaria.

In his wars with the Tungani states, Yakub Beg carried his army to the environs of Urumchi and Hami. Aksu and Kucha fell into his hands late in 1867, Korla in 1869, and finally, Karashar and Turfan in 1871.³¹ In these battles, Yakub Beg did not always conduct his troops in person, so that the glory of victories was often shared by his two sons, Kuli Beg and Hacı Kuli Beg, as well as by his old trusted lieutenant, Abdulla. Nevertheless, having already assumed the title of *Athalik Ghazi* or "Champion Father", he now gained the additional appellation of *Badaulet*, or "favorite of fortune". Although he never took actual possession of Urumchi and Hami, he ruled over, by the end of 1873 at the height of his power, the whole of Eastern Turkestan south of the Tien Shan and west of Chiktam. By the time the wars with the Tunganis ended, at the close of 1873, he was absolute ruler over the lives of an estimated 1,015,000 people.³² We shall now show how his rule was maintained, and discuss the salient features of his administration.

YAKUB BEG'S ADMINISTRATION

We shall not enumerate the titles of the officials in Yakub Beg's court since they are already described in Forsyth's *Report*. Whether he employed a *dasturkhwanchi* (butler) or a *hudaychi* (chamberlain) does not help much for an understanding of Yakub Beg's administration. On the

³⁰ Marshall Broomhall, *Islam in China: A Neglected Problem* (London-Philadelphia, 1910), p. 158.

³¹ Boulger, *op. cit.*, p. 127-33.

³² Forsyth, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

other hand, Yakub Beg's role in history cannot be well evaluated without some analysis of the total features of his rule.

One of the most remarkable characteristics or traits of his administration was the impact of his personality on the affairs of state. The absoluteness of his control was felt in every sphere of government. For example, although his *dadkwahs* or governors of the fifteen districts³³ enjoyed extensive powers in their respective areas of jurisdiction, their powers were in fact checked by the *kazis* or judges, who were responsible for any infractions of the Islamic Shariat. Both the *dadkwahs* and *kazis* owed their appointments to the Athalik Ghazi and none but he could pass on offenders the maximum sentence of death.³⁴ Moreover, Yakub Beg made an official report to him periodically on the important occurrences in their districts; during these interviews, any petitions of complaint leveled against these officials were publicly considered. In this way general efficiency was maintained among the officials, who owed their positions only to the favor of their chief.

Another way in which Yakub Beg maintained personal loyalty to himself was his method of disposing land. After the subjugation of Western Kashgaria, he had declared himself the sole landowner of the entire state. The lands seized from the former Moslem *wangs*, he distributed to his most loyal followers in return for military service.³⁵ The remaining land he sold to augment his treasury. So much had the state become a part of himself that it is difficult to envisage how such a state could exist beyond his lifetime. He, and he alone was the indispensable man.

The court at Kashgar provides an illustration of Yakub Beg's personal impact on his administration. While adhering to the most scrupulous simplicity and avoiding any pomposity and pretentiousness, his court yet observed the minutest details of etiquette. For example, as Boulger remarked:

With the exception of a few of his kinsmen and more intimate associates, none were permitted to be seated in his presence. Even these could not be seated within a certain distance of their sovereign. All subjects who were allowed to approach his person had to do so in the humblest manner and with the deepest expressions of humility and subjection.³⁶

³³ These fifteen districts were Khotan, Yarkand, Yangy Hissar, Ush, Turfan, Akau, Kucha, Kurla, Karashahr, Turfan, Lob, Maralbashi, Sarigh Kul, Kirghiz, and Pakhpuluk. From Forsyth, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

³⁴ Boulger, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 141.

On the other hand, his officials were to be dressed with the greatest simplicity and even his highest aides were not to be distinguished from others by any external insignia. All these measures naturally were intended to emphasize his unique role in the affairs of state. Still, the importance attached to simplicity were also an indication of the influence of Islam.

Without doubt, the Islamic imprint on Yakub Beg's administration constituted one of its most remarkable features. Having become the supreme law of the land, the Shariat was vigorously enforced by the government. From the ruler himself, the mosques received large tracts of land, which were to remain tax-free.³⁷ Religious education was also encouraged. In this connection, there is the story of an Arabian priest, who joined Forsyth's party in 1871 in order to fetch a good price for his "Arab books and Korans"³⁸. In his evidently exaggerated picture, Shaw maintained there were "sixty colleges, with endowments in land, for the students of Mussulman law and divinity" in Yarkand.³⁹

Furthermore, the most remarkable evidence of Yakub Beg's Islamic orientation is provided by his relationship with the Ottoman Empire. Despite its evident decay, that empire was still the focus of Moslem loyalty in Central Asia largely because its Sultan occupied the religious role of Caliph. After Hadji Torah, Yakub Beg's nephew and envoy, arrived at Constantinople in 1873, Sultan Abdul Aziz (1861-1876) conferred on the ruler of Kashgar the title of Amir, or Chief. Henceforth, Kashgaria acknowledged the suzerainty of the Ottoman Empire. Yakub Beg, in coining his silver tungas, stamped his name on one side and the Sultan's on the other. Moreover, the Ottoman flag became the standard of his state.⁴⁰ Strictly speaking, the alliance with the Ottoman Empire had very little practical value, separated as they were by intervening Russian and Persian territories. The Ottoman connection was, however, a reflection of the sentiment for Islamic identity that characterized Yakub Beg's administration.

Two factors of importance seem to have weakened the basis of Yakub Beg's power. The first was his dependence on foreign elements of his army, for Khokandians, Afghans, and Badakshis really formed the nucleus of that army.⁴¹ These cavalymen or *jigit* were far more depend-

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 158.

³⁸ *The Times* (London), August 31, 1871, p. 4.

³⁹ R. S. Shaw, "A Visit to Yarkand and Kashgar (1868)", *Proceedings of Royal Geographical Society, London*, 14, no. 1 (Feb. 28, 1870), p. 125.

⁴⁰ *The Times*, March 16, 1874, p. 5.

⁴¹ Boulger, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

able as fighters than the foot-soldiers or *sarbaz* enlisted from the local Uighurs. Of his other troops, the Kirghiz were essentially untrustworthy, and the three-thousand Chinese "New Moslems" were never permitted to leave the immediate vicinity of Yarkand and Kashgar. Not being a Kashgarian himself, Yakub Beg perhaps did not realize the gravity of having to depend on non-Kashgarian troops, but the lack of a wide local basis for a trustworthy army became increasingly obvious as the Tungan wars continued. By the end of these wars in 1873, only an estimated half of his 20,000 men in 1867 remained.⁴² The rigors of his discipline provided another cause for the loss of his troops through desertions. Besides, with the news of the meagerness of spoils, additional Khokandian, Afgan, and Badakshi forces could not be induced to join Yakub Beg's ranks. Thus, the military basis of his power was being slowly sapped.

Another factor of weakness was the discontent created among the local inhabitants through heavy taxation. Though first levied to finance the Tungan wars, these taxes remained unchanged after their termination. First, there was a tithe on all cereal products under the name of *ushr*.⁴³ Then there was a *tanabi* or tax on vegetable and fruit lands. The actual practice of tax collection, however, gave much leeway to the tax-collector, who measured his receipts not on the actual yields of the land, but on the acreage planted. For example, on certain lands, in Yangy Hissar, the *ushr* actually amounted to three parts in ten.⁴⁴ Moreover, since the landowner on the whole did not cultivate his estate but let it out to tenants, the burden of these tenants can well be imagined. Besides paying the government these taxes, they usually surrendered three-fourths of their net produce to their landlords, leaving the remainder for themselves. In the cities, the owners of shops and booths were required to pay a weekly tax for police protection.⁴⁵ This plus the fall of trade with China Proper made the lives of merchants difficult. Without doubt the economic consequences of these heavy taxes detracted much from the popularity of Yakub Beg's regime.

The police system in Kashgaria was uniquely fitted to discover and combat discontent – a feature that received the particular attention of Russian and English travellers. This police system consisted of two components: municipal and secret. The municipal branch can be easily defined, its chief functions being the maintenance of order and security.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 143.

⁴³ Forsyth, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

⁴⁵ Boulger, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

After prohibited hours at night, the municipal police could pick up those still in the streets and charge them with vagrancy. Moreover, the police functioned as inspectors of passports, which were required for any inhabitant passing from one district to another within Kashgaria.⁴⁶

The secret police, on the other hand, eluded any scrutiny. In the words of one writer, "they are everywhere, and amongst all classes, and nobody knows who they are, or how they act. . ."⁴⁷ Nevertheless, it was generally known that they had communication only with the local governor or judge and that they attached themselves particularly to foreign envoys.⁴⁸ Once their disguise was discovered, however, the effectiveness of these agents was drastically limited. It is not surprising therefore that these ramifications of police interference created an atmosphere of tension and distrust among Yakub Beg's subjects.

YAKUB BEG'S RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA AND ENGLAND

Apart from his relations with the Ottoman Empire, Yakub Beg maintained relations with only two other foreign powers, Russia and England. Partly from geographical proximity and partly from fear of the other's influence, Russia and England made Kashgaria the scene of intense rivalry. The mutual dislike created by the conflict of interest in the Ottoman Empire, in Persia, and in Afganistan as well as in China made Kashgaria a much more sensitive area than it would otherwise have been. Hence when treating Yakub Beg's relations with one of these powers, one should bear in mind the interest of the other power and also the maneuvers of rivals.

Yakub Beg's Relations with Russia

From the first days of his rule Yakub Beg's attitude toward Russia was characterized by dislike – a dislike that can be traced to the defeats he had suffered at Ak Musjid and Tashkend. Russia's constant expansion at the expense of the Central Asian khanates had meanwhile culminated in her taking of Tashkend in 1865 and of Samarkand in 1868. These events, while making the subjection of Bokhara and Khokand by Russia only a matter of time, impressed on Yakub Beg the eventual necessity of

⁴⁶ Forsyth, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

⁴⁸ Boulger, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

reaching some kind of agreement with the Russians. It is plain, however, that he minimized the significance of Russian advances by his continuous prosecution of the Tungani wars.

Yakub Beg's confidence in his own strength received a severe shock in 1871, when the Russian army occupied the Kuldja or Ili region, Russia having until then been much more interested in Kuldja than in Kashgaria. The fertility of soil as well as Russia's past trade connections made Kuldja desirable. After the fall of Ili in January 1866, an unstable regime had been established by the Tungani and Taranchi victors. But when disputes between these two groups had by 1870 put a complete stop to all trade in the area, Russia decided to intervene. The fear that Yakub Beg, having now consolidated his rule in Kashgaria, might take over Kuldja undoubtedly precipitated the Russian action. The Athalik Ghazi's anger was intensified when Russia acknowledged that China was still the rightful master of the whole of Chinese Turkestan. After the Russian occupation of Kuldja, the Russian minister at Peking reiterated his government's willingness to withdraw as soon as the Manchu government could send a sufficient force there to maintain law and order.⁴⁹ The Russian gesture toward China, coupled with her disregard for Kashgarian interest in Kuldja, drove Yakub Beg to adopt severe measures against Russian traders in his territory.

These restrictive measures took several forms, but the net result was a worsening of relations between Russia and Kashgaria. According to a Russian observer:

Our merchants were subjected to perpetual surveillance while in his dominions; their merchandise was valued at arbitrary rates, very considerably lower than the current market prices and was taken from them whether they wished it or not, for the benefit of Yakub Beg himself, who gave in exchange raw silk and coarse cotton stuffs of native make, appraised at rates out of all proportion to their real value.⁵⁰

Moreover, when two Kirghiz who had robbed Major Zagroshky, a Russian official in charge of the district of Tokmak, fled to Kashgaria, Yakub Beg refused to surrender them to the Russian authorities.⁵¹ Finding Yakub Beg not amenable to any overtures, the Russians even sought the co-operation of Khudayar, the Khan of Khokand, to claim his rule over Kashgaria. Khydayar, however, privately informed Yakub Beg of Russia's intentions, and advised caution in dealing with them.

⁴⁹ Henri Cordier, *Histoire des Relations de la Chine avec les puissances Occidentale* ... (Paris, 1901-1902), II, p. 173.

⁵⁰ Tarentyev, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 266.

Thereupon Yakub Beg sent a letter to General Kaufmann, the Russian governor-general, demanding official recognition of his rule in return for any concessions on his part. In the letter he wrote in no uncertain terms about Russian commercial penetration:

The Russians who have come here, into my state of Kashgar, look at these localities and become acquainted with the state of the country, and therefore it is better to forbid their coming, for they are a treacherous and crooked-minded people.⁵²

These words of contempt perplexed the governor-general in his estimate of Yakub Beg's real strength. But they had the effect of spurring on Russian initiative.

In May, 1872, Baron Kaulbars, an explorer of the sources of the Syr Darya and a captain of the Russian General Staff, undertook the first Mission to Kashgar. His chief objectives seemed to be three: first, to estimate the real resources and strength of Kashgar; secondly, to evaluate Yakub Beg's policy in Central Asia; and thirdly, to seek expansion of Russian trade in advance of the English, who had already sent a mission in 1870. Included in the Kaulbars Mission were Captain Scharnhorst and Kolesnekof.⁵³ The former, an officer of the Survey Department, was to take astronomical observations. The latter, a merchant by profession, was to collect information regarding the wealth of the country and the nature of goods most in demand in Kashgaria.

Externally the Kaulbars mission was pre-eminently successful. The Russians were given a hearty welcome at Kashgar. They had complete freedom of movement during their stay and two of their members received permission to extend their investigation to Yarkand and Khotan.⁵⁴ Military parades were held in their honor. They could not help being impressed by the military exactitude with which these maneuvers were carried out. The mission culminated with the conclusion of a treaty on June 2 (May 21 according to Russian calendar), 1872 which had among others the following terms:

1. The right of free entrance on the part of Russian merchants, and guarantee of their safety in Kashgaria.
2. The exclusive right of Russian merchants to use caravansaries for storing their merchandise. Kashgarian merchants were to be accorded the same privileges in Russian territory.
3. The reciprocal establishments of commercial agents or caravan-bashis.

⁵² Boulger, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

⁵³ Terentyef, *op. cit.*, p. 282.

4. The lowering of duties on Russian goods to a uniform rate of $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ *ad valorem*.

5. Reciprocal right of transit in the territories of both parties.⁵⁵

Though the advantages Russia gained by this treaty seem considerable, the actual results were far from satisfactory to the Russians. Indeed, it is difficult to see how Yakub Beg's past animosity toward Russia could be blotted out by the mere arrival of the Kaulbars Mission. The concessions he granted should be viewed only in the light of a maneuver for more time. After the conclusion of the treaty, two important factors came into the picture: his recognition as Amir by the Ottoman Sultan in early 1873, and the increasing interest displayed by Great Britain in his state. In view of the intense hostility between Russia and the Ottoman Empire Yakub Beg could not consistently be friendly to both. His Islamic background made it necessary for him to cast his lot with the Ottomans. Moreover, the British interest in Kashgaria, after the visit of Kaulbars mission, encouraged Yakub Beg to take a tougher stand against Russia. In fact he sometimes acted as though the treaty with Russia did not exist. Although Russian goods were flooding the market of Kashgaria by 1873, he resorted once again to seizure and compulsory sale of such goods, as well as confinement of Russian merchants.⁵⁶

The provocative nature of Yakub Beg's measures did not fail to alter eventually the attitude of the Russians. In 1875 no fewer than 20,000 Russian troops massed to strike at Kashgaria.⁵⁷ It is doubtful whether under these handicaps Yakub Beg's state could have survived. Only the sudden outbreak of a rebellion in Bokhara and Khokand, by engaging the attention of these troops, saved the fate of Kashgaria. In 1877 Russia took steps to hasten the downfall of Yakub Beg by supplying grain to Chinese troops on their way to reconquer Kashgaria. In doing so, the Russians intended to eliminate British influence on Yakub Beg – an influence they vastly overrated as we shall see when we turn to Yakub Beg's relations with England.

Yakub Beg's Relations with England

England's interest in Yakub Beg's new state was dictated essentially by two considerations: a concern over possible Russian invasion of India

⁵⁴ Boulger, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 320–1.

⁵⁶ Terentyef, *op. cit.*, p. 287.

⁵⁷ Boulger, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

through Kashgaria, and potential trade in the area. Parallel with these considerations is the interest which the explorations of English travellers aroused concerning future possibilities in this area. This last is a factor which can hardly be overestimated.

British concern over possible invasion of India from the north dates from the year 1800. In that year, Tsar Paul of Russia made some active preparations for an invasion of India. Although Alexander I cancelled that move as soon as he ascended the throne in March, 1801, the British ever since regarded with suspicion every Russian move in Central Asia. The possible routes by which Russian troops could conceivably cross into India were successively investigated by British agents: Mir Izzet Ullach in 1812-13, William Moorcroft in the 1820's, and John Wood in the 1830's.

British interest in Central Asia was further increased by two factors. First, the British final conquest of Punjab in 1849, and her subsequent granting of Kashmir to a Sikh renegade, extended her influence to the southern border of Kashgaria. Secondly, the Russians had gradually taken over the Syr Darya Valley in the period 1849-54. It, therefore, seemed inevitable that these two European powers should meet somewhere in Eastern Turkestan.

British interest in the possibilities of trade with Central Asia had grown with the fear of invasion of India. In 1864 the first of a series of elaborate reports on Central Asian trade was published.⁵⁸ That same year, the Maharajah of Kashmir consented to the British request to reduce his duties on trade passing through his territory. In 1867, after Yakub Beg's seizure of power, a British official was appointed to Leh, Ladakh to promote the development of commerce with Kashgaria.⁵⁹ In short, the British were expecting much from this trade. Indicative of this sentiment was the optimistic account in *The Times* (London) which pointed out that "trade between India and Turkestan had risen from 55,000 pounds in 1867 to 129,000 pounds in 1869."⁶⁰

The catalyst that brought about British-Kashgarian relations was the propaganda effect of the travels of one man, Robert B. Shaw. Shaw had been an Indian government agent at Leh, a tea planter, as well as a traveller. While he was in Leh, he requested through an official of Yakub Beg then returning from a visit to Punjab permission to enter Kashgaria. The granting of this request by the Kashgarian ruler made

⁵⁸ Owen Lattimore, *Pivot of Asia* (Boston, 1950), p. 29.

⁵⁹ Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 384.

⁶⁰ *The Times*, August 31, 1871, p. 4.

Shaw the first Englishman to arrive in Kashgar in December, 1868. Although his journey was not undertaken in any official capacity, he met an exceptionally cordial reception, for during a three-month stay, he had several interviews with Yakub Beg. But the sudden appearance of another Englishman, G. W. Hayward, who could not explain his activity in Kashgaria as other than that of a surveyor, greatly compromised Shaw's position. Suspected as spies, both were put under confinement, though they were in no way mistreated. Late in the spring of 1869, after British remonstrance, both were released. After his return to India, Shaw wrote glowing accounts of the new state to the north. In this propaganda crusade, he elaborated on the populousness and wealth of Kashgaria as well as on the security of life and property there. In a series of letters Shaw urged the Manchester and Bradford manufacturers to make use of this market.⁶¹ In a lecture he gave in 1870, he said: "In the street will be found spread the silks of China, in another the cotton goods and prints of Russia, sugar, tea, spices, and all kinds of foreign produce."⁶² The impression was not lost on the British officials in India that if England were to stay out of Kashgarian markets, Russia would soon obtain a virtual monopoly. The consideration of trade was reinforced by political ones as well. In this way, Shaw prepared for the later missions of Forsyth in 1870 and 1873.

Though the Forsyth mission of 1870 marked a new departure in the relations between England and Kashgaria, it did not accomplish anything of diplomatic importance. The mission was actually sent because of a request from Yakub Beg to the British Viceroy, then Lord Mayo, for the establishment of some kind of diplomatic relations. The Viceroy thereupon appointed Thomas D. Forsyth (1827-1886), who had been an assistant commissioner at Simla, to head the mission. This mission was not to assume any political character, but "merely for the purpose of gathering information upon the history and present conditions of Kashgaria and upon the state and prospects of trade between that country and India."⁶³ The amount of £1750 was allowed for the expenses of the expedition, which included some sixty men, and one hundred and thirty baggage ponies.⁶⁴ Among the party were Shaw, George Henderson, a geographer, and Allen Hume, a biologist. After leaving Srinager in June, these men endured for more than 500 miles the hardships of travel at an elevation

⁶¹ "A Visit to Turkestan", *The Athenaeum*, no. 2885 (February 10, 1883), p. 186.

⁶² Shaw, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

⁶³ *The Times*, August 31, 1871, p. 4.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

varying from 15,000 to 18,000 feet. Nevertheless, the members of the mission failed to meet Yakub Beg in person, for he happened to be engaged at this time in the Tungani wars far to the east. Hence, in the month of September, 1870, the Mission departed from Yarkand for India.

Nevertheless this mission exercised some influence on later developments. First of all, such a short stay in Kashgaria after so arduous a journey raised the question of Yakub Beg's good faith in extending the invitation, not to mention the inconvenience suffered by the British party.⁶⁵ But it is hard to see what Yakub Beg could gain by avoiding a meeting with Forsyth. Moreover, it does not appear that Forsyth's hurried return to India was dictated by any cause other than the fast approaching winter which would seal off the mountain passes for months to come.⁶⁶ Besides, the mission could not be regarded as a complete failure. It marked the beginning of important communication between England and Kashgaria; it also resulted in the collection of valuable geographical and biological data by members of the mission. For example, the book by Henderson and Hume, *Lahore to Yarkand*, was written as a result of this trip.

British relationship with Yakub Beg reached its culmination during the second Forsyth mission of 1873. The reason for the mission can largely be traced to the English uneasiness at the conclusion of the treaty of 1872 between Yakub Beg and Russia. Though, Yakub Beg had once more in 1871 renewed his assertion of friendship with the British viceroy, no result came from the overture. In 1873, however, it was the British who took the initiative in resuming relations with Kashgaria. In March of that year, when Yakub Beg's nephew, Hadji Torah, passed through India on his way to Constantinople, he was royally entertained by the new British viceroy, Lord Northbrook. In October, when Hadji Torah returned to India, he found himself joined by another British mission to Kashgaria. This mission, again headed by Forsyth, was much more formidably staffed than the first. Among the group were Lieutenant-Colonel T. E. Gordon, the second-in-command, who later explored considerable portions of the Pamir and Dr. Henry W. Bellew, Surgeon-Major, who was entrusted with the medical needs. There were also three military men – Captains Chapman, Trotter, and Biddulph – the first being the secretary, and the other two holding scientific posts. In addition, an escort of ten sepoy, furnished by the Corps of Guides, and six Indian

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, October 31, 1870, p. 12.

⁶⁶ Lattimore, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

officers made up the party. Altogether the mission consisted of three hundred men and four hundred animals.⁶⁷

The most notable achievement of the second Forsyth Mission was the cementing of friendly relations by the conclusion of a treaty with Yakub Beg. From the arrival of the English party in Kashgar on December 4, 1873, Yakub Beg lavished a most cordial hospitality on his guests, for whom a special "pavilion" or *Elchikhana* had been built as a residence. The Athalik Ghazi gave a formal reception on December 11, when Mr. Forsyth presented a letter in a casket of quartz and onyx stones from Queen Victoria. In a spirit of chivalry Yakub Beg pronounced the Queen as "the Sun, in whose rays such poor people as I flourish."⁶⁸ In such a friendly atmosphere the negotiations for a treaty proceeded, for on February 2, Yakub Beg put his signature on the final draft. This treaty granted the English most of the privileges granted to Russia in 1872. The terms included:

1. The right to enter, reside, and trade by the subjects of one party in the territories of the other.
2. The right of free transit.
3. No import duties on goods from India should exceed $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent, *ad valorem*.
4. The right of British subjects to purchase, sell, or hire houses or depots for the storage of merchandise.
5. An exchange of representatives, who would be entitled to the rank and privileges of ambassadors by the law of nations.⁶⁹

There were other clauses regulating passports and merchandise; but among those listed above, the most significant was certainly the legal recognition England accorded to Kashgaria through an exchange of ambassadors. No other Central Asian khanate at the time enjoyed this privilege of being treated by Britain as a sovereign nation.

The actual results of the Treaty of 1874 were not as great as expected. A few weeks after the conclusion of the Treaty a trading company was formed by some English and Indian merchants.⁷⁰ This Central Asian Trading Company, however, did little business. In fact, after Forsyth's thorough report on the impracticability of any modern army passing through the Karakoram, England lost considerable interest in Kashgaria. Nevertheless, Russia became interested in the relations between England

⁶⁷ Forsyth, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶⁹ Boulger, *op. cit.*, p. 322-9.

⁷⁰ *The Times*, July 21, 1874, p. 10.

and Yakub Beg. During a visit to Kashgar in 1874, Colonel Reinthal of the Russian army staff expressed an alarmist view of British influence:

"1. The English had given a large number of percussion rifles.

2. Great Britain had built a foundry, in which muzzleloading rifles are converted into breech-loaders. Aided by the English, 4,000 rifles have been so converted.

3. There are several powder manufactories in Kashgar."⁷¹

Although this was a much exaggerated picture of British aid, the British after their treaty with Yakub Beg took a much friendlier attitude toward the Amir than did the Russians. When Yakub Beg was on the brink of disaster in 1876 the British Minister at Peking, Sir Thomas Wade, even proposed to the Tsungli Yamen (Foreign Office) to allow the Amir to keep his kingdom, provided he acknowledged the over-lordship of China.⁷²

In conclusion, we may observe that the actual relations between Yakub Beg and either of the two European powers never reached the degree of intimacy that was generally imagined. Russia and England each thought the other was exerting a preponderant influence in the affairs of Kashgaria. In fact, Yakub Beg jealously guarded the independence of his state. Had it not been for Anglo-Russian rivalry, the diplomatic importance of Kashgaria would have been negligible and it was remarkable of Yakub Beg that he could exploit this rivalry to such advantage. Even if he had not succeeded in obtaining protection, he did succeed in providing a new bone of contention between the two European powers not to mention Afghanistan, Persia, and the Ottoman Empire.

THE DOWNFALL OF YAKUB BEG AT THE HANDS OF TSO TSUNG-T'ANG

It is debatable how long Yakub Beg could have held his power had the Chinese troops not advanced into his territory. The possibility of a Russian invasion of Kashgaria could not be discounted after 1875. The inability of the Ottomans to aid the Amir, and the British unwillingness to impose protection meant that Yakub Beg had to rely entirely on his

⁷¹ Aleksei N. Kuropatkin, *Kashgaria*, trans. Walter E. Gowan (Calcutta-London, 1882), p. 193.

⁷² W. L. Bales, *Tso Tsung-t'ang: Soldier and Statesman of Old China* (Shanghai, 1937), p. 360.

own resources. But after 1873 his Afghan, Badakshi, and Andijani troops had undergone slow but certain deterioration in consequence of the comforts of city-life. Among the less privileged Kashgarians, discontent had been growing over his excessive taxation. Moreover, the enforced discipline which made his state into a vast monastery according to one Russian observer, did not elicit much enthusiasm from his subjects.⁷³

Yakub Beg's downfall was precipitated by two causes: the basic superiority of the Chinese expedition forces, and his own miscalculation of strategy.

The superiority of the Chinese troops under Tso Tsung-t'ang (1812-85) over Yakub Beg's lay not in numbers and weapons alone, but also in generalship. Against Yakub Beg's 17,000 trained men and 10,000 Tungani irregulars, there was a Chinese army of 89,000 men in 178 battalions.⁷⁴ Although the Amir had about thirty field pieces, most of them were too old for actual use. On the Chinese side, however, were Krupp field guns and mortar pieces.⁷⁵ These favorable circumstances the Chinese troops had were considerably enhanced by the leadership of Tso. Having already proved his ability in the suppression of the Taiping and Nien rebellions, Tso could now draw upon his past experience in the conquest of Eastern Turkestan. Although his two generals – Chin Shun and Chang Yao – bore the brunt of actual battles, it was Tso's co-ordination as well as his energy and resolution that brought about the final victory.

General Tso's campaign however, was faced with numerous problems. First of all, being a Chinese, he did not always enjoy the complete confidence of the Manchu court. Only after two Manchu generals had been defeated in Kansu was he sent to take their place in 1868. Later, the Court sent envoys to Tso's camp to check and report on his activities. Having completed the pacification of Kansu in 1873, powerful officials including the Viceroy Li Hung-chang questioned the advisability of marching into Eastern Turkestan. On this issue, Tso vented his strong indignation in a memorandum:

Since very ancient times, China's frontier troubles have been graver on the north-west... To capture Eastern Turkestan is to protect Mongolia; to protect Mongolia is to guard the capital.⁷⁶

⁷³ Kuropatkin, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

⁷⁴ Bales, *op. cit.*, p. 325.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 326.

⁷⁶ Wu, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

Motivated primarily by this strategic consideration, the Manchu court approved the expedition to Eastern Turkestan.

The foremost problems of Tso's expedition were money and food. He solved the first by requesting the throne to borrow ten million taels from foreign banks in Shanghai. Despite initial opposition, the request was finally granted. The problem of food taxed Tso's ingenuity. First, he ordered his troops to plant crops in their spare time on the oases they conquered. The primary purpose of this measure, however, was not so much that the army itself should harvest the crops, but that it would encourage settlement of the lands that had been left desolate since the outbreak of the Tungan rebellion. Nonetheless, Tso's "agricultural army" solved in this way much of its food supply. Another measure Tso resorted to was to buy food from the Russians. In June 1875, Captain Sosnowsky, a Russian traveller and staff officer, arrived at Lanchow to meet General Tso. The Russian readily agreed to a contract to deliver three million *chin* of grain to Kucheng in Dzungaria at $7\frac{1}{2}$ taels per hundred *chin* – a price much cheaper than the cost of transport over the long route from China Proper.⁷⁷ By April, 1876, the Russians had delivered not only three million *chin*, but an additional million as well. Thus, ably led and adequately provided, the Chinese troops advanced into Yakub Beg's territory by the winter of 1876.

Although ultimately the basic superiority of the Chinese forces would probably outweigh any preparation Yakub Beg could make, he might yet have prolonged the life of his state had he concentrated his military strength nearer his home base. Instead, he sent his forces to Turfan, almost eight hundred miles to the east of Kashgar. Confidence in his own strength and contempt for the Chinese forces probably induced him to his rash strategy. But his supply route from Kashgar had become nearly as long as that of the Chinese. Moreover, on arrival at Turfan, he merely waited and watched the gradual elimination of the Tungani states of Dzungaria instead of co-operating with them against the common foe. With the Chinese occupation of Urumchi on August 18, 1876, the fate of Yakub Beg rapidly approached its *denouement*. In April, 1877, first in a battle near Turfan, then in another at Toksun, forty miles further west, Yakub Beg met disastrous defeats. Most of his troops either surrendered or deserted. Having retired to Korla, the Amir died in May, 1877.

The causes of Yakub Beg's death still remain obscure. Chinese sources rather uniformly agree that he died through suicide in which he admin-

⁷⁷ Bales, *op. cit.*, p. 336.

istered the poison himself. Western sources, though crediting this possibility, also accept the likelihood of murder, probably committed by a local chief of Korla. The important fact, however, was not how he died but that he did die, and that with his death, his state lay in ruins.

THE AFTERMATH

The death of Yakub Beg plunged the western portion of Kashgaria, as yet unoccupied by the Chinese, into a state of chaos. Yakub Beg's eldest son, Kuli Beg, jealous of the popularity of his younger brother, Hacc Kuli Beg, had the latter killed. But Kuli Beg's power hardly extended beyond the towns of Kashgar and Yarkand. As soon as news of the Amir's death arrived, local insurrections broke out in most of the towns that once acknowledged his rule. In some cities, resistance to the advancing Chinese centered around a Tungani leader, Pei Hu-cheng, who had earlier fled from Kansu. The fragmentation of power, however, was hardly conducive to any unified action. Having captured Kucha and defeated Pei Hu-cheng in a bloody battle, the Chinese forces converged on Aksu in October, 1877. By December 17, Kashgar itself was taken, with Kuli Beg and Pei Hu-cheng fleeing into Russian territory. With the fall of Kashgar, active resistance in Kashgaria to Chinese advance ceased. Of the whole of Eastern Turkestan, only Kuldja remained outside of Chinese control.

The problem of recovering the Kuldja region from Russia became the next objective of the Manchu government. Russia had promised in 1871 to return Kuldja to China whenever sufficient Chinese troops could be sent there to maintain law and order. When this condition was satisfied in 1878, however, the Russian minister at Peking announced that only after a settlement of other outstanding issues could the return of Kuldja be considered. Consequently, a Manchu envoy, Ch'ung Hou, was dispatched to St. Petersburg in January, 1879, as ambassador. The resulting Treaty of Lividia resulted in granting to Russia the upper part of the Tekes Valley, right to establish consular offices in all cities of the Tarim Basin, as well as a considerable sum for the maintenance of Russian troops during their occupation of Kuldja. Since vociferous indignation greeted these terms, the Manchu government never ratified this treaty. War with Russia seemed imminent and Chinese troops in Kashgaria were mobilized. Even such foreign friends of the Manchu government as Charles Gordon advised that Kuldja be given to Russia. When the Chinese envoy to the Court of St. James, Tseng Chi-tse, was

appointed to negotiate with the Russians, the outlook for any agreement was dismal indeed. Nevertheless, by February 1881, a new treaty was signed, giving back the Kuldja region to China. In this Treaty of St. Petersburg, Russian consulates in China's Northwest were limited to two: one at Chiayukuan, the other at Turfan. On the other hand, the expenses of Russian occupation which China had to pay, were placed at nine million dollars.

With the ratification of the Treaty of St. Petersburg, a turbulent era in the history of Eastern Turkestan came to an end. In 1882 the whole territory was made as a province of China under the name of Sinkiang, or "New Dominion".

CONCLUSION

An Evaluation of Yakub Beg

Like most remarkable men, Yakub Beg was a compound of contradictions, of strengths and weaknesses. When we survey the vicissitudes of his career, many faults seem to stand out. Nevertheless, in the light of his limited resources, his achievements were remarkable.

On the one hand, he was a shifty politician as his career in Khokand shows. His unnecessary wars with his Tungani neighbours were both short-sighted and self-defeating. His hesitation in coming to the aid of Khokand and Bokhara during their revolt against Russia in 1875 underscored the emptiness of his claim to be the champion of Moslems in Central Asia. Moreover, his rash decision to meet the incoming Chinese forces at Turfan diminished whatever reputation he had as a military leader.

On the other hand, his achievements as the indisputable ruler of a region long torn by civil strife unquestionably gave him a prominent place in the history of Central Asia. If he did not conquer as much territory as Tamerlane or Nadir Shah, the circumstances in which he consolidated his power deserve admiration. By uniting the southern portion of Eastern Turkestan, he provided order and security for twelve years to a region noted for the heterogeneity and unruliness of its population. Without his presence, Kashgaria after 1865 might well have become a battleground of petty states. The lack of any leader of Yakub Beg's caliber among the Tungani gave rise to just such a situation.

His Significance

It must be remembered that for a time Yakub Beg held the balance of power in Central Asia. The pivotal position of his state enabled his influence to be felt in the courts of Great Britain, Russia, the Ottoman Empire, and China. The international recognition he won derived from the strength and not from the weakness of his position. In the Anglo-Russian rivalry of the latter half of the Nineteenth Century, Kashgaria provided a new stage and furnished a new barometer for international action.

Yakub Beg's second significance lay in the fact that his state reflected a general resurgence of Islam throughout Asia. At the time of his rule in Kashgaria, a Moslem Panthay state was set up in the province of Yunnan in southwest China. At the other end of Asia, Jemal ed-Din el-Afghani was preaching his doctrines of Pan-Islamism, a doctrine later adopted by the Ottoman Sultan, Abdul Hamid. Although his relations with the Ottoman Empire was essentially religious in nature, the spectre of Islamic unity had already haunted the imagination of Russia and England, both of whom were rulers of considerable Moslem populations.

The third significance of Yakub Beg is shown in the effect he had on Chinese policy in Chinese Turkestan. With the appointment of a great Chinese general, Tso Tsung-t'ang, to head the expedition, the Manchu government departed from its basic traditional policy toward the frontier regions. Henceforth, Chinese Turkestan ceased to be a special field reserved exclusively for Manchu Bannermen. In another sense, the Chinese reconquest earned for China a signal military victory in a century of military disasters. The rise in prestige of the Manchu government in both domestic and foreign eyes conceivably prolonged the life of the dynasty. Moreover, the Russian and British entanglement in Eastern Turkestan convinced the Manchu government that more direct control was necessary. The establishment of the province of Sinkiang was therefore a crucial result of Yakub Beg's rule.

An imponderable question in evaluating Yakub Beg's significance is the extent of his contribution to more recent Moslem and Uighur nationalism. It is almost impossible to say whether the leaders of the ephemeral "East Turkestan Republic" in 1944 were in any way inspired by Yakub Beg's example. Yet, the very fact that for a time he established in that area an independent state, he might well have been in the minds of those leaders. In fact, it may even be said that Yakub Beg himself represented an embryonic form of nationalism, in which the factor of nationality was

submerged under the drive for religious identification. Certainly, in his relentless wars against his Tungani neighbours, he showed a streak of the exclusiveness reminiscent of the nationalism of the Magyars, who in 1848 once freed from Austria, began to oppress the Serbs and Croats.

For us today, Yakub Beg provides an insight to the present politics of Central Asia. Whatever relations there are among the Soviet Union, Communist China, and India, Sinkiang will always remain a sensitive area affecting the destiny of all her three neighbours.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Contemporaneous Sources:

Bellow, Henry Walter, *Kashmir and Kashgar: A narrative of the embassy to Kashgar in 1873-74* (London, 1875), xix, 419 pp.

The author was a Surgeon-Major of the Bengal Staff Corps during the second Forsyth mission. His accounts of scenes and people, though rather rambling, were quite factual.

Boulger, Demetrius Charles de Kavanagh, *Central Asian Portraits, the celebrities of the Khanates and the neighboring States* (London, 1880), viii, 310 pp.

Vivid descriptions of Khudayar, Yakub Beg, and Tso Tsung-tang.

—, *England and Russia in Central Asia*, 2 vols. (London, 1879).

Comprehensive treatment of Anglo-Russian rivalry both in its overt and covert forms. The second volume was more useful.

—, *The Life of Yakob Beg; Athalik ghazi, and Badaulet; Ameer of Kashgar* (London 1878), xii, 344 pp. Map.

The only biography now in existence. Drew no distinction between Chinese and Manchus, both referred as khitays. Value much impaired by lack of footnotes.

Forsyth, Thomas Douglas, *Memorandum on Routes from the Punjab to Eastern, Turkestan* (Simla, 1868), 21 pp. Map.

Useful in giving distances between different points on route from the Punjab to Yarkand.

—, *Report of a Mission to Yarkund in 1873* (Calcutta, 1875), 573 pp. Map, photos.

Thorough and objective. Most valuable on the history, geography, and government of Yakub Beg's state. Also containing notes on geology and commerce. Great defect lies in the lack of an index.

Henderson, George, and Hume, Allan, O., *Lahore to Yarkand* (London, 1875), xiv, 370 pp. Map.

Part I contains an eyewitness account of the expedition of 1870 and its reception at Yarkand. Part II deals with birds and plants along the route.

Hutton, James, *Central Asia: from the Aryan to the Cossack* (London, 1875), viii, 472 pp.

Deals with Central Asian history since the Scythians. Comprehensive survey of Yakub Beg's rule in two chapters.

Kurpatkin, Aleksei Nikolaevich, *Kashgaria: Historical and geographical sketch of the country, its military strength, industries, and trade*, trans. Walter E. Gowan (Calcutta-London, 1882), viii, 255 pp.

The author was a colonel on the General Staff of Imperial Russian army. His travels in Kashgaria in 1876 brought forth the Russian counterpart of Forsyth's *Report*.

Schuyler, Eugene, *Turkistan. Notes of Journey in Russian Turkistan, Khokand, Bukhara, and Kuldja*, 2 vols. (London, 1876).

The author was a member of the American Geographical Society. His vol. II has a comprehensive section on the developments in Kuldja. He also dwells on the Kaulbars mission.

Shaw, Robert Barkley, *Visits to High Tartary, Yarkand, and Kashgar, and Return Journey over the Karakoram Pass* (London, 1871), 486 pp.

A classic. Has interesting accounts of the customs of people along his route. Also gives details of his detention with Hayward.

Showers, Charles Lionel, *The Central Asian Question* (London, 1873), xii, 31 pp.

As a colonel in the British army, he discusses the basic British policies with regard to Central Asia.

Stumm, Hugo, *Russia in Central Asia*, trans. J. W. Ozanne and H. Sachs (London, 1885), xi, 359 pp.

Written by a German military man, the book presents a penetrating study of Russian military deployments in Central Asia.

Terentyef, Mikhail Afrikanovich, *Russia and England in Central Asia*, 2 vols. (Calcutta, 1876).

Vol. I has a useful chapter of Russia's relations with Yakub Beg. Exaggerates the importance of the English missions to the Amir.

The Times, London, 14 December 1869 — 20 December 1877.

Has a considerable number of articles on the two Forsyth missions. Quite helpful in understanding the British attitude toward Yakub Beg.

The Peking Gazette, Translations from, 1872–1878. Shanghai, reprinted from the *North-China Herald*.

Useful chiefly in reporting the preparations of Tso Tsung-tang.

Wyllie, John William Shaw, *Essays on the External Policy of India*, ed. W. W. Hunter (London, 1875), xxx, 371 pp.

The only essay of relevance is the one on "Western China." Here, the author merely treated the Tungani rebellion until 1867, but the editor continued the account to the signing of the treaty in 1874 between England and Yakub Beg.

Non-contemporaneous Sources:

Bales, William Leslie, *Tso Tsung-t'ang, Soldier and Statesman of Old China* (Shanghai, 1937), xvi, 436 pp. Maps.

An able biography, but has little on Yakub Beg.

Barthold, Vasilii Vladimirovich, *La découverte de l'Asie; histoire de L'orientalisme en Europe et en Russie*, trans. B. Nikitine (Paris, 1947), 367 pp.

Treats the whole continent, but there is hardly anything on Yakub Beg.

—, *Histoire des Turcs d'Asie Centrale*, trans. Mme. M. Donskis (Paris, 1945), 202 pp. Deals mostly with the Turks before the 18th Century. But does provide useful background material.

Boulger, Demetrius Charles de Kavanagh, *Central Asian Question; Essays on Afghanistan, China, and Central Asia* (London, 1885), xvi, 457 pp.

Useful in his treatment of the Kuldja Question.

Broomhall, Marshall, *Islam in China, a neglected problem* (London-Philadelphia, 1910), xx, 332 pp. Maps.

Comprehensive treatment of both general and historical phases of Islam in China. There are two chapter on Moslem rebellions, one on the Tungani in 1862, the other on the Panthay in Yunnan.

- Chu, Wen-djang, *The Policy of the Manchu Government in the Suppression of the Moslem Rebellion in Shensi, Kansu, and Sinkiang from 1862 to 1878*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1955. 439 pp.
Thorough treatment of the Manchu position. Extensive account of Tso's preparations. But there is little on Yakub Beg.
- Cordier, Henri, *Histoire des relations de la Chine avec les puissances occidentales*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1901-02).
Only vol. II with three chapters on the Kuldja Question is useful. The author made mistake in designating Yarkand as Yakub Beg's capital (p. 172).
- Gatteyras, Joseph André, *À travers l'Asie Centrale* (Paris, 1884), iv, 280 pp.
Throws light on Russian expansion in Central Asia, but has very little on Yakub Beg.
- Hummel, Arthur W., ed., *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period*, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1943).
Provides scholarly articles on Amursana, Ch'ung Hou, Galdan, Tseng Chi-tse, and Tso Tsung-tang.
- Kiernan, E. Victor Gordon, *British Diplomacy in China, 1880 to 1885* (Cambridge, 1939), xi, 327 pp.
Has a comprehensive chapter on the "Kashgar Crisis", though dealing essentially with the dispute over Kuldja.
- Lattimore, Owen, *Pivot of Asia: Sinkiang and the Inner Asian Frontiers of China and Russia* (Boston, 1950), xii, 288 pp.
Provides brief but informative sketch of Yakub Beg in the light of Anglo-Russian rivalry.
- Skrine, Francis Henry Bennett, and Ross, Edward Denison, *The Heart of Asia; a History of Russian Turkestan and the Central Asian Khanates from the earliest Times* (London, 1899), xi, 444 pp. Maps, photos.
Began from about 500 B. C. Yet, the chapters on the Khanates evoke the atmosphere in which the early life of Yakub Beg was spent.
- Wu, Aitchén K., *China and the Soviet Union: a Study of Sino-Soviet Relations* (New York, 1950), xvi, 434 pp.
Has a chapter on Tsarist Russia's relations with Chinese Turkistan.

Articles:

- "Chinese Reconquest of Eastern Turkistan", *Spectator*, 51 (1878), pp. 466-67.
Drew the attention of British public to the little noted Chinese expedition.
- Ellis, William, "Results of the Observations taken by Mr. Shaw during his Journey to Yarkand in 1870", *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society*, 41 (1871), pp. 372-92.
Discusses the prospects of trade with Kashgaria. Skeptical of Shaw's glowing reports, but concerned with Russian moves.
- Frechtling, Louis E., "Anglo-Russian Rivalry in Eastern Turkistan, 1863-1881", *Journal of Royal Central Asian Society*, 3 (1939), pp. 471-89.
Thorough and objective analysis of his subject. Extremely useful. Took the point of view that the Treaty of St. Petersburg was not actually a Chinese diplomatic triumph.
- Macartney, George, "Eastern Turkestan: The Chinese as rulers over an alien Race", *Proceedings of the Central Asian Society, London*, 1907, 27 pp.
Although his remarks pertain to the post-Yakub Beg period, he does point out the changes that have taken place since the Chinese reconquest.
- Shaw, Robert B., "A Visit to Yarkand and Kashgar", *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society*, 14, no. 1 (February 28, 1870), pp. 124-37.
The article shows Shaw greatly impressed by Yakub Beg's regime.

Trotter, Henry, "The Amir Yakoub Khan and Eastern Turkestan in mid-nineteenth Century", *Journal of Royal Central Asian Society*, 4, no. 4 (1917), pp. 95-112. Does not really add anything new to other sources.

Chinese Sources:

Pai, Shou-i, *Hui-min chi-i* (The Moslem Rebellions) (Shanghai, 1953), 4 vols.

Contains detailed accounts of Tso's expedition, the problem of his supply, and a proclamation, by which Tso sought to divide and conquer the Moslems on his way to Kashgaria.

Tseng, Shen-wu, *Chung-Kuo ching ying hsi-yu shih* (History of Chinese exploration and administration of the Western Regions) (Shanghai, 1936), 713 pp.

Gives a short but penetrating analysis of Yakub Beg in four pages (325-9). States that the Amir has been purchasing arms from England.

Wang, Shu-nan, ed., *Hsin-Chiang tu chih* (Gazetser of Sinkiang) (Tientsin, 1923), 32 vols.

This encyclopedic work, containing 160 books, deals with such phases as history, geography, foreign relations, military affairs, etc. I found the two sections: nationalities (book 16-21) and biographies (book 113-14) helpful.

Wei, Kuang-tao, *K'an ting Hsin-Chiang chi* (Account of the Pacification of Sinkiang), Privately printed, 1899, 4 vols.

A detailed account of Chinese conquest of 1876-78 by a historian of the latter part of the nineteenth century. Valuable for checking up names of people and places as well as dates.

REVIEW

The Collected Works of *Ramana Maharshi* edited and annotated by *Arthur Osborne*, London, Rider and Company, 1959, 192 pages, 18 sh. net.

Ramana Maharshi, who may be regarded as one of the most important Indian 'Saints' and Sages of the last century, taught the traditional philosophy of Advaita Vedānta. Being a native of South India and born from a middle-class Brahman family, he realized the Self, i.e. he awoke to consciousness of his identity with the Universal Spirit, when he was a lad of seventeen. He did not write much, but from time to time he translated one or another of the works written by, or ascribed to, the great philosopher Śaṅkara, whose teachings he had accepted as his own. Of his other works, his Self-Enquiry, Upadesa Saram, Five Hymns to Arunachala and the two sets of Forty Stanzas, had only been available separately in pamphlet form. Arthur Osborne, who is a devotee himself, collected, in this volume, the Sage's works, viz. Self-Enquiry; Who am I?; Five Hymns to Śrī Arunachala, Forty Verses, Upadesa Saram or The Essence of Instruction and Miscellaneous Verse and, in addition to these, five adaptations and translations. Having introduced the Sage to the West with his biography 'Ramana Maharshi and the Path of Self-Knowledge', Osborne was of course the man for editing these articles and prefacing them by a short life and characterization of the author. He also supplied some explanatory notes and a glossary to his edition. The responsibility for the interpretation of the Vedānta must of course lie on the author. Osborne's somewhat scanty explications are not always correct, and some of the statements contained in the glossary may lead the readers astray.

Utrecht

J. Gonda

Annelies Kammenhuber

Hippologia hethitica

1961. Ca. 448 Seiten, broschiert ca. DM 64.—

Günter Lanczkowski

Altägyptischer Prophetismus

(Ägyptologische Abhandlungen, Band IV)

1960. VIII, 112 Seiten, broschiert DM 18.—

Franz Rosenthal

A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic

(Porta Linguarum Orientalium, Neue Serie, Band V)

1961. X, 99 Seiten, broschiert DM 15.—

C. E. Sander-Hansen

Altägyptische Grammatik

1961. Ca. 270 Seiten, broschiert ca. DM 40.—

Delectus veterum carminum arabicorum

Carmina selegit et edidit *Th. Noeldeke*. Glossarium
confecit *A. Mueller*

Unveränderter Nachdruck der 1. Auflage

1961. XV, 240 Seiten, broschiert DM 16.—

Hans Wehr

A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic

Edited by *J. Milton Cowan*

1961. XVII, 1110 Seiten, broschiert DM 74.—, Leinen DM 80.—

Wörterbuch der klassischen arabischen Sprache

Auf Grund der Sammlungen von *August Fischer*,

Theodor Nöldeke, *Hermann Reckendorf* und anderer Quellen
herausgegeben durch die Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft

Lieferung 2: 1960. S. 41-104, 4°, broschiert DM 9.—

Paul Kunitzsch

Untersuchungen zur Sternnomenklatur der Araber

1961. 125 Seiten und 2 Abb., broschiert ca. DM 16.—

Some other publications:

American Studies in Uralic Linguistics

Edited by the Indiana University Committee on Uralic Linguistics

Vol. I. 1960. 356 pages. 14×21 cm. f 15.25

Alexandre Bennigsen et Chantal Quelquejay

Les Mouvements Nationaux chez les Musulmans de Russie

Vol. I: Le "Sultangaliévisme" au Tartarsta

1960. 285 pages, 2 maps, 1 plate. 16×24 cm. f 25.—

David M. Farquhar

**A Description of the Mongolian Manuscripts and Xylographs
in Washington, D.C.**

1955. 58 pages. 16×24 cm. f 10.—

Bernard Geiger, et al.

Peoples and Languages of the Caucasus

A Synopsis

1959. 77 pages, map. 15×22.5 cm. f 8.—

Aert H. Kuipers

Phoneme and Morpheme in Kabardian (Eastern Adyghe)

1960. 124 pages. 15×22.5 cm. f 16.—

Nicholas N. Poppe

Buriat Grammar

1961. 136 pages. 13.5×21.5 cm. f 11.—